JPRS-TAC-86-076

25 SEPTEMBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-076
25 SEPTEMBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Criticism of Reagan ABM Treaty Extension Offer
(Moscow PRAVDA, 13 Aug 86; Moscow TASS, 14 Aug 86)..... 1

PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER Cited 1
'Nothing But Deception' 2

PRAVDA, U.S. Test Ban Rejection Linked to SDI
(V. Mikhaylov; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 Aug 86)..... 3

PRAVDA, TASS Reports on U.S. SDI Developments
(Moscow PRAVDA, 31 Aug 86; Moscow TASS, 5 Sep 86)..... 7

Test Facilities Planned, by V. Sukhoy 7
Abrahamson: U.S. To Continue 7
'Concrete Contours' Emerging, by Vladimir Bogachev 8

USSR Army Paper Outlines U.S. Space Arms Programs
(V. Chernyshev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Aug 86)..... 9

TASS Reports Successful U.S. ASAT Space Test
(Moscow TASS International Service, 23 Aug 86)..... 12

Moscow TV Criticizes Latest U.S., ASAT Test
(Vsevolod Solovyev; Moscow Television Service, 27 Aug 86).... 13

International Forum Expresses 'Anxiety' Over SDI
(Moscow TASS, 1 Aug 86)..... 14

Moscow TV's 'Studio 9' Program Discusses SDI
(Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, et al.; Moscow Television
Service, 23 Aug 86)..... 15

Soviet Paper Examines Aims, Cost, Feasibility of SDI
(G. Dadyants Interview; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 13 Aug 86)..... 27

Soviet Colonel on Perils of EDI as 'Euro-SDI'
(Vladimir Chernyshev; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 32, 10 Aug 86). 30

TASS Sees 'Undisguised Irritation' in FRG Over SDI Access
(Vladimir Smelov; Moscow TASS, 18 Aug 86)..... 36

USSR: Mid-August Comments on Japanese SDI Role
(Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 12 Aug 86; Moscow TASS, 15, 26 Aug 86)..... 37

'Inclination to Participate', by Dmitriyev 37
Nakasone on 1969 Resolution 38
Integrated Circuits 38

USSR: Comments on Impending Japanese SDI Announcement
(Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 3 Sep 86; Moscow TASS, 4 Sep 86)..... 39

Broadcast to Japan, by Dmitriyev 39
TASS Warns on 'Consequences', by Askold Biryukov 40

PRC People's Daily on U.S., W. Europe Conflict Over SDI
(Te An; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 22 Aug 86)..... 42

Soviet Scientists Comment on USSR's 'Anti-SDI System'
(Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 23 Aug 86)..... 43

Briefs
TASS on Australian SDI Report 45
TASS on Reagan Shuttle Announcement 45

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRC People's Daily Urges U.S., USSR To Reduce Armaments
(Wen Yun; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 24 Aug 86)..... 46

SALT/START ISSUES

IZVESTIYA Hits U.S. SALT Accords Attitude
(V. Matveyev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 Aug 86)..... 47

Soviet Chief of Staff Akhromeyev on U.S. SALT II Policy
(Moscow TASS International Service, 4 Sep 86)..... 51

TASS Reports on U.S. ICBM Tests
(Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 26 Aug 86; Mowcow TASS, 1 Sep 86) 52

MX Test 52
Trident-1 Test 52

TASS Announcements on Soviet Missile Tests in Pacific
(Moscow TASS, 27 Aug 86; TASS International Service, 1, 4 Sep 86)..... 53

27 August 53
1 September 53
4 September 54

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Soviet Chief of Staff Akhromeyev Attends CDE
(Moscow TASS, 28 Aug 86; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 30 Aug 86). 55

Arrival in Stockholm 55
Meets Swedish Officials 55
Addresses Plenary Session 56
Departs for Moscow 57

TASS Interviews Chief of Staff Akhromeyev on CDE Issues
(Moscow TASS International Service, 4 Sep 86)..... 58

Discusses Aerial Monitoring 58
Views NATO Proposal 58
Says Agreement Possible 59

USSR: Reports, Comments on End of 1986 CD Session
(Moscow TASS, 28, 29 Aug 86; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 30 Aug 86)... 60

Israelyan Speech, by Yevgeniy Korzhev 60
Results Assessed 61
Israelyan Interviewed 62

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Soviet Defense Aide on U.S. Aims in Continued Testing
(V. M. Shabanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Aug 86)..... 63

TASS Cites U.S. Peace Group on Secret Nuclear Test
(Moscow TASS International Service, 6 Sep 86; Moscow TASS, 7 Sep 86)..... 65

Test Codenamed 'Galveston', by Maksim Knyazkov 65
Bogachev Commentary, by Vladimir Bogachev 65

Moscow TV Report on Monitoring Station in Kazakhstan
(V. Lyashko; Moscow Television Service, 3 Sep 86)..... 67

Moscow 27 August Press Conference on Test Ban, SALT II, SDI
(Various sources, various dates)..... 68

Broadcast on TV, by Gennadiy Gerasimov, et al. 68
PRAVDA Report, by N. Bragin 77
TASS Report 78

TASS: Japanese Protest Against U.S. Ship Call
(Moscow TASS, various dates)..... 82

TBS TV Poll Taken 82
Socialist Party, TU's Meet 82
'Attack' on Non-Nuclear Policy 82

PRAVDA Reports on New Zealand NFZ Legislation
(O. Skalkin; Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Sep 86)..... 84

BEIJING REVIEW: Soviet Motives for Nuclear Moratorium
(Zhang Liang; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 35, 1 Sep 86)..... 85

USSR Pledges To Sign South Pacific NFZ Protocols
(Wellington THE EVENING POST, 27 Aug 86)..... 86

Editorial Urges U.S. To Make Concessions
(Hong Kong SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST, 30 Jul 86),..... 87

Briefs
U.S.-Soviet Talks 4 September 89

RELATED ISSUES

Zhukov Assails U.S. Response to Initiatives
(Yuriy Zhukov; Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Aug 86)..... 90

PRAVDA Lauds Socialist International's Stance on Arms
(V. Rybakov; Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Aug 86)..... 92

Soviet Talk Show on Economic Burden of Arms Race
(Vladimir Pozner, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 31 Aug 86)..... 95

PRAVDA Reiterates Joint Asian Security Tenets
(W. Ovchinnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Sep 86)..... 99

IZVESTIYA: Nicaragua Charges U.S. With 'Meteorological War'
(Yevg. Bay; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 1 Sep 86)..... 102

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: CRITICISM OF REAGAN ABM TREATY EXTENSION OFFER

PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER Cited

PM140845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Article under the rubric "Verbatim": "PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER: Who Is Being Led by the Nose?"; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] The Reagan administration is leading the American public by the nose by claiming that on 25 July the President offered the Soviet Union a compromise formula which could pave the way to a new arms treaty. In actual fact, as Reagan is making it daily increasingly clear, the formula proposed by him provides for an arms buildup and foretells death for arms control. The administration maintains that the President proposed slowing down the implementation of his plans to build a giant ABM system in space, known under the name of SDI, or the "star wars" program, if the Russians undertook a nuclear missile reduction. In principle this could be the first step to the "grand compromise" which champions of arms control were hoping for--to exchange the SDI program, whose feasibility is doubted by leading scientists, for concessions by the Soviet Union, which does not wish to enter a period of a new race for the latest arms in space.

IN FACT, HOWEVER, THE PRESIDENT DID NOT PROPOSE SUCH A COMPROMISE. ANY CLAIMS BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO HAVE MADE "SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS" ARE A PRETENCE. ITS PROPOSED "DEFERMENT" SDI DEPLOYMENT FOR 5-7 YEARS MEANS LITTLE. THIS PROGRAM'S DIRECTOR HAS DECLARED THAT IT COULD TAKE AT LEAST 10 YEARS TO DEPLOY EVEN THE VERY FIRST ELEMENTS OF AN ABM SYSTEM. BUT THE CHIEF THING IS THE TERMS DEMANDED BY THE PRESIDENT FOR THE SO-CALLED DEFERMENT. HE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THE SOVIET UNION ADMIT IN ADVANCE THAT SDI CAN BE DEPLOYED AT THE END OF THE 5-7 YEARS. Such a proposal in no way corresponds to the essence of the "grand compromise."

STILL MORE DECEPTIVE IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLAIM THAT THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL WILL STRENGTHEN THE STATUS OF THE 1972 ABM TREATY. REAGAN PROPOSES "EXTENDING" THIS TREATY BY 5-7 YEARS. IN FACT, HOWEVER, HIS PROPOSAL WILL RESULT IN THIS TREATY'S GRADUAL EMASCULATION OVER 5-7 YEARS AND, PROBABLY, IN ITS FATAL WEAKENING AT THIS TIME BY UNILATERALLY CHANGING THE INTERPRETATION OF ITS PROVISIONS. THIS ABM TREATY WILL BE DEAD AFTER 1993...

By all accounts, the President is still clinging to his dream of SDI and is reluctant to abandon it.

After sending Moscow the letter on 25 July, Reagan bluntly declared that SDI is "not a subject for negotiation" and maintained that America will deploy its weapons systems regardless of the Russians' actions. He did not put an end to the internal argument within the administration over questions of arms control or undertake to examine versions of difficult decisions on these questions, which the President alone can make...

THE PATH WHICH RONALD REAGAN IS TAKING DOES NOT LEAD TO A NEW TREATY WITH THE USSR. LIKEWISE, IT DOES NOT BRING HIM ANY NEARER TO HIS DREAM OF CREATING A "SECURITY SHIELD" AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WHICH IS ALMOST CERTAINLY DOOMED BECAUSE OF SCIENTIFIC AND BUDGETARY LIMITATIONS. IT LEADS TO THE UNDERMINING OF THE EARLIER CONCLUDED AGREEMENTS IN THE ARMS SPHERE, WHICH ENSURED A CERTAIN STABILITY IN THE RIVALRY BETWEEN THE SUPERPOWERS OVER THE PAST 20 YEARS, LEAVING NO BASIS FOR ACHIEVING MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT TREATIES IN THE FUTURE. THUS, THE ADMINISTRATION IS MISSING THE MOST REAL CHANCE FOR MANY YEARS OF USING MOSCOW'S CLEARLY EARNEST INTEREST IN REDUCING ARMS. IF THE PRESIDENT WANTS PRECISELY THIS, LET HIM SAY SO FRANKLY AND NOT MISLEAD THE PUBLIC (AND PERHAPS HIMSELF TOO) BY CLAIMING THAT HE HAS PREPARED THE GROUND FOR A COMPROMISE.

'Nothing But Deception'

LD141625 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 14 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS -- What is the meaning of the U.S. proposal to extend for seven years the operation of the ABM timeless treaty? This question is put to the "NEW TIMES" weekly by Nikolay Shishlin.

What a concession, what a step toward the Soviet position can there be, if U.S. leaders responsible for SDI declare that it will take at least 9-10 years to develop and test all components of the programme.

In light of this it is obvious that the United States pledge to keep with the treaty for seven years is nothing but deception, N. Shishlin writes. It is precisely over this period that Washington plans to conduct research and tests of SDI components, in other words, to prepare the material scientific and technical base for the deployment of these sophisticated weapons in space.

There is not the slightest sign of any reassessment of the situation by the present U.S. Administration. The arms race is stepped up in all directions.

While high U.S. political leaders talk about the possibility of achieving a "great compromise", they constantly demand the build up of the U.S. military might. For what purpose? For the creation of the main prerequisite of the success at the talks with the Russians, no more no less.

The Soviet Union, as it was declared more than once, is for the holding of a new [illegible]-U.S. summit meeting, it must achieve advance toward serious agreements on truly important questions of consolidating international security.

[illegible]oviet Union backs up its political goodwill by actions, Nikolay Shishlin writes.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: U.S. TEST BAN REJECTION LINKED TO SDI

PM041116 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[V. Mikhaylov article: "Attack on Infinity; On the Moratorium, Earthly Matters, and Star Plans"]

[Text] Sudden events often revive unexpected memories. That was the case with me when I heard the report of the latest -- if only it were the last! -- explosion at the Nevada nuclear test range. My mind suddenly went back to 2 years ago in Stockholm, but not to the hall of sessions of the all-European conference on confidence-building measures, but to the national museum. I was looking at a Goya painting. The great Spaniard conveyed his understanding of history. He called the picture "Our Earth" -- a sort of wondrous light in the boundless darkness of chaos -- alone and alive. Were it stifled, history would be crushed. Forever.

If I could, I would parade all the idolaters of nuclear weapons in front of Goya's picture. And who knows, maybe some of them would feel some filial sentiments for our mother earth. But there is little hope of that. Most of this company have turned the service of nuclear weapons into a new religion and are frenzied in their defense of their "right" to improve what is already a supermodern big stick.

How much energy is currently being expended across the Atlantic in building a propaganda rampart around the U.S. nuclear test ranges! How much inventiveness is spent on erecting new bastions to replace those already stormed! Quite recently the Pentagon defended itself in a broad front against the world public's demands to end nuclear tests. But, contrary to the laws of acoustics, the long silence at Soviet test ranges has generated a powerful echo. It has grown with each new extension of the moratorium and artificial positions have collapsed.

Thus the thesis about the "propaganda" nature of the Soviet steps has basically lost its impact. Every unbiased person realizes that nobody would take such a difficult step for more than a year for the sake of propaganda at a time when the other side is building up its nuclear arsenals.

Nor is the argument that the USSR held a major series of tests just before the moratorium and could therefore "easily pause" being used anymore. Even if that were so, given the contemporary standard of equipment overseas, that "pause" could easily be made up over the course of a year. Yet the moratorium has been extended until 1 January 1987. And this at a time when the United States has in fact invariably been the champion in terms of the number of tests at all stages of the development of nuclear weapons.

Nor are the opponents of the moratorium sticking to their former assertions that they did not have the technical ability to monitor [kontrolirovat] observance of the moratorium. The detection of three unannounced explosions in Nevada by our national technical means, the Soviet-U.S. scientific research begun near Semipalatinsk, and the USSR's reaffirmation of its readiness for international on-site inspection [proverka na mestakh] have cut the ground from under this artificial thesis too.

All these false arguments, however, are still being repeated. But, I think, this is being done more from inertia than anything else and in a desire to conceal their deliberately misleading nature. The broad front of defense of nuclear weapons has had to be reduced willy-nilly to a circular defense. But the defenders are becoming fiercer and more perfidious. They base their defense of nuclear weapons on two main arguments, allegedly with a logical connection. The arguments are:

One: Since the defense of the West is based on nuclear weapons, those weapons need constant checking. That is why the moratorium violates international stability.

Two: Only the implementation of the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI), known as the "star wars" program, will make nuclear missile weapons "powerless," and their "demise" will be accompanied by the disappearance of the need to test them.

This is a specious concept and, judging by appearances, intended not just for one day. It seems to be a promise to put a stop not only to nuclear tests but to the weapons themselves. We have only to wait. But is it worth it?

If one takes this concept at face value the nuclear threat will disappear with the creation of an antimissile space shield. SDI leaders plan to begin building such a shield in about 10 years. They give no indication as to when it will be completed. They talk about 20 years as a guideline. This means that it would not be possible to embark on ending nuclear tests and destroying the weapons themselves before the year 1006. And then only on condition that many "ifs" materialize. For instance, will the idea of an "impenetrable space shield" be technically feasible? Throughout the millennia there has never been a case of an even stronger sword not being able to penetrate a strong shield. Of course, this time may prove to be the exception. However, will not the creation of this "shield" be so costly that America will go down the tube? That question is even being asked by certain proponents of SDI. According to existing calculations, it will cost $2 trillion to put the entire system into space and another $300 billion a year to maintain it. And the main "if" is: Will mankind not be overwhelmed by mountains of weapons by then? It is on the basis of this scenario from the defenders of U.S. nuclear test ranges that the "improvement" of offensive strategic arms is to continue.

Now let us suppose that the miracle happens and all the "ifs" materialize. What then? After 2 decades of an intense arms race, there would hardly be a better chance to overcome militarist blinkered thinking in a society where weapons are business. You cannot invest money spent on weapons in environmental protection. And the terrible impoverishment of the developing countries would lead to very serious shocks.

That is the most favorable forecast. And only if one takes Washington's theses at face value. In fact, the world could expect far gloomier times were it to agree to a nuclear arms buildup, much less the militarization of space.

The current work on the "star wars" program is proof that SDI is not a means of salvation from nuclear weapons. On the contrary, it is a generator of a buildup in these arms, since it is a question of using the power of a nuclear explosion to hit

targets in space and on earth with laser beams. But there is no guarantee that in time nuclear charges themselves will not appear in low-earth orbit. The desire for space superweapons, as is openly admitted in the United States, is one of the reasons why it is refusing to end tests at the Nevada test range. It is planned to hold around 100 nuclear explosions merely to develop a nuclear-pumped laser. A number of these explosions were included in the 18 held in the year that the Soviet moratorium has been in operation. So SDI is leading not to the destruction of nuclear weapons but, on the contrary, is accelerating the development [razrabotka] of new types of these weapons.

The vivid colors in which the United States paints the "inoffensiveness for all life" of the space weapons it is creating could be envied by Munchausen himself. But when have new weapons ever been "worse" than the old ones? They have always surpassed them either in destructive power, accuracy, or killing force, and often in terms of all deadly parameters. There are no grounds for supposing anything else with regard to strike weapons for space. In the United Statess the work to limit energy losses when beams pass through the atmosphere has been accelerated. And this will make it possible to hit targets not only in open space but on earth too and to carry out surprise strikes against enemy defenses. And if it is possible to pierce the metallic shell of a missile, it is only a short way to the temptation of razing an enemy's cities. Our country has already experienced once the effects of the "scorched earth" strategy.

That is how the Pentagon scenario for "maintaining stability in the world" looks in practice. Its authors would like to infect the world with a belief in the miraculous properties and potential of supermodern space means of destruction and thereby keep the world on its old dead-end path of amassing weapons. And this is the main thing -- they would like to prevent the first, hardest, and most important step being taken in a new direction: ending nuclear tests. They want to block at the outset the implementation of the Soviet program to rid the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

What is proposed instead? New weapons. Not only new in technical solutions, but fundamentally different in essence. Hitherto weapons have proliferated on the earth, in the seas, or in the skies. However large these areas may be, they have borders and limits. Space has no limits. It is infinite. And that in itself could be an irrevocable disaster for planet Earth. It will be impossible to place limits on filling "bottomless" space with weapons. The arms race will become limitless. And it is hard to escape the suspicion that it is being transferred to space to prevent it from being controlled by people on earth. In space there is no need to fear protest demonstrations or possible blockades around military bases.
In short, from the viewpoint of the weapons manufacturers, space is an ideal environment with unlimited potential. But for the earth and the people on it this "use" of space would lead to an unprecedented growth in the threat of war both now and in the future.

Hitherto it has been believed that newly discovered areas should be used for man's benefit. But people want to treat space differently. From their first steps into this still little-known world the Pentagon men wanted to put up a notice saying "Military Zone. Civilians Prohibited." Yet science forecasts that in the future the universe may provide mankind with no less than it has on earth. Thus SDI brings with it unpredictable military threats. But it is an attack on infinite space with its still unknown riches.

Of course, nobody talks openly about this plot, particularly in the place where it emerged -- the U.S. military-industrial complex. but in the country and throughout the world a downright biblical picture of the appearance of the "star wars" program is disseminated. Pentagon chroniclers tell fondly of how R. Reagan once visited a

strategic forces command post. And after various scenarios of a clash between the United States and the USSR were "played out" before him with an invariably catastrophic outcome, the President got the idea of finding a way of "defending the country." That is the official version, and that is why SDI is often called the "President's initiative." Its prehistory, however, is forgotten.

The fact is that in the seventies, soon after the first strategic arms agreement between the United States and the USSR (SALD I) leading U.S. military concerns, concerned at a possible reduction in their profits as a result of arms limitation, created a special research group. It confirmed their fears. Moreover, it became clear that existing weapons types promised no big dividends, since the technical capacity for developing them had been almost exhausted. An entirely new "mother lode" was needed. Certain firms' existing studies on space weapons served to spur development of the "star wars" program. It was skillfully presented to the President as a "means of saving" America and the world from a nuclear catastrophe.

Since then the pioneers of the "mother lode" in space together with the President and his "team" have with striking inventiveness termed this dangerous space venture a nationwide concern and branded its opponents disloyal.

A quarter of a century D. Eisenhower in his farewell speech before leaving the presidency warned those who would assume the post about the dangerous blandishments of a "combination of an enormous military organization and a vast military industry." The current President's predecessor -- J. Carter -- saw a great deal of this for himself. He confirmed the existence in Washington of a "very powerful lobby" that constantly demands "colossal buildups in military potential beyond the bounds of reason." This experience of his predecessors' should have suggested to President R. Reagan that old ideas do not become new, even in the form of the most supermodern technological solution. The authors of the "Mexico Declaration" are right in stating that to cure a drug addict by giving him bigger and bigger fixes is as impossible as saving the world from war by amassing larger and larger weapons arsenals.

The time has come for action. The most dangerous shortage for our earth -- lack of a sense of responsibility for the future on the part of a number of Western statesmen -- must be eliminated. Nobody has the right to attack the infinity of the universe or the infinity of the human race!

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA, TASS REPORTS ON U.S. SDI DEVELOPMENTS

Test Facilities Planned

PM041020 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "'Star Wars' Test Ranges"]

[Text] New York, 30 Aug — Judging from U.S. press reports, the "star wars" program has gradually begun to be fleshed out and to acquire increasingly specific and sinister outlines. THE WASHINGTON POST's well informed military commentator Walter Pincus reports that at the beginning of next year the Pentagon intends to begin building a new military space complex on the Pacific atoll of Kwajalein. Special airborne targets will be fired into the sky from the launchpads of the complex, which will cost $1.3 million. Experimental missiles will be fired at the targets from army firing ranges on the west coast of the United States.

The "Pentagon fantasists" are planning great changes at the White Sands test range (New Mexico). There they will test "endoatmospheric interceptor missiles" designed to destroy MIRVed warheads during entry into the atmosphere. White Sands will house a gigantic laser which will "dazzle" the enemy missiles and put "undesirable" satellites out of action.

The Edwards Air Force Base (California) continues to play an important role in the "star weapons" tests. During 1987 specially equipped F-15 fighter bombers will take off from there on at least three occasions to test top secret antisatellite weapons at relatively low altitudes.

Abrahamson: U.S. To Continue

LD050924 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Washington September 5 TASS — Speaking in Cincinnati, Ohio, Lieutenant-General James A. Abrahamson, director of the strategic Defence Initiative organisation, said that the United States intended to go ahead with building up efforts to create an anti-missile system with space-based elements.

Judging by his speech, the SDI programme has already gone far beyond the framework of "research" and entered the stage of the practical development and building of components for the "star wars" system.

'Concrete Contours' Emerging

LD052119 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 5 Sep 86

["Illusory Hopes of Apologists of 'Star Wars'" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The U.S. Administration continues its vigorous efforts to deploy a large-scale space-based anti-missile defence which is absolutely unambiguously prohibited by the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems. At the same time the U.S. Administration comes out with propaganda statements that the United States is observing and will continue observing the terms of that treaty.

THE WASHINGTON POST points out that the U.S. "star wars" programme starts assuming concrete contours in facilities and systems, and not just in descriptions on paper. In the days ahead the Pentagon intends to test a space system for guiding a laser to target in near-earth space. A "killer satellite" and a target will be put into space. Director of the U.S. "star wars" programme Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson announced that the United States had concluded creating and testing the "miracle" ABM infra-red laser meant for the deployment in space.

A report that came from Tokyo says that the United States intends to involve Japan in the creation of the so-called system for intercepting tactical ballistic missiles. Washington also intends to make Israel, South Korea and European allies in NATO its accomplices in the violation of the 1972 treaty which prohibits transferring ABM systems or their components to other states or deploying them outside the national territories.

As the congressional discussion of the administration's request for the appropriation of over five billion dollars in the 1987 financial year for the preparations for "star wars" is drawing nearer, statements are made in Washington that the implementation by the United States of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) would allegedly envigorate talks on arms control. Meanwhile unbiased experts on military affairs justifiably note that the main flaw in the U.S. "star wars" programme is that it precisely undermines the prospects of removing the threat of nuclear war, enhances distrust among countries, destabilises the military-strategic situation in the world.

American apologies of the militarisation of outer space see their task above all in enabling the biggest war industry monopolies of the United States to get huge profits from the SDI programme, to try exhaust the Soviet Union economically, weaken it politically and ensure military superiority for the United States. These calculations rest on the underestimation of the possibilities of the Soviet Union, of other socialist countries and on overestimating the United States potential.

No one will be able to intimidate socialist countries with the "star wars" programme or with other fantastic military projects.

Absolutely illusory are Washington's hopes to compel the USSR to make extra military expenditures. If need be, the Soviet Union will promptly give an answer to the SDI, and it will not be what the USA expects it to be. This answer will devalue the "star wars" programme.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR ARMY PAPER OUTLINES U.S. SPACE ARMS PROGRAMS

PM291440 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Aug 86 First Edition p 3

["Military Observer's Notes" by Candidate of Technical Sciences Reserve Colonel V. Chernyshev: "Seven Stories of SDI"]

[Text] Huge gloomy structures, in some respects resembling medieval castles, drift through the emptiness of space. Each one has its own purpose: "Combat space platforms," "Orbiting killer satellites," "Interceptor-space gliders"... All these are constituent elements of the U.S. "space fortress." An "impregnable" fortress designed to ensure that "great America" is able at any price to look imperiously and haughtily down at the whole world and, if necessary, also...

Fantasy? Delirium? Not at all. According to official Washington terminology, these are elements of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Thousands of people in the United States are already planning, designing, developing [razrabatyvat], testing, and creating [sozdavat] these extraterrestrial monsters. Only not for defense. They are creating [sozdavat] them to draw in space "new borders, new frontiers of the American empire" and to achieve military superiority over the USSR.

Foreign military experts say that the purpose of SDI is to create conditions for making a preemptive nuclear strike against the Soviet Union without fearing a counterstrike, which is to be repulsed by an ABM defense with space-based elements. A preemptive nuclear strike is the chief object of the entire "defense initiative." It is no coincidence that the United States is now intensively building up its strategic offensive nuclear potential -- MX, Trident, and Midgetman ballistic missiles, B-1B and ATB (Stealth) strategic bombers, air-, sea-, and ground-based strategic cruise missiles, and medium-range ballistic missiles. The Washington strategists need the "space shield" in order to make confident use of this entire arsenal.

The intensive development [razrabotka] of space-strike arms is taking place on the other side of the ocean, and the question of how to deploy them "most efficiently," which orbits to choose, how many combat space platforms are needed, and precisely which types of weapons it is expedient to use in space is being worked out.

The United States has already drawn up a general, "integrated" plan for a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. A special group of 10 corporations -- Pentagon contractors -- under the leadership of the SDI organization has examined alternative versions of the system, including at first 4, then 5, 6, and now even 7 echelons (in the United States they are called "stories" and "tiers") of deployment of space-strike arms.

What is meant by these "stories"?

The first two, which correspond to the active part of the missiles' flight, will be occupied by combat space stations with directed radiation weapons (laser, beam weapons) and also with kinetic weapons (small homing missiles and electromagnetic cannons). Two other stories, which again include the aforementioned weapons, are designed to hit missiles in the ballistic section of their flight.

A further, fifth story of the system could also be created [sozdat] for the ballistic section of the missiles' flight. According to a report in THE NEW YORK TIMES, here it is proposed to create "clouds" of particles or aerosols, which are to facilitate the "selection" of targets in space. The last two stories will be "controlled" by two types of ground-launched interceptor missiles designed to destroy missile warheads directly before they enter the atmosphere and in dense layers of the atmosphere.

The Pentagon has already carried out the corresponding calculations for the initial deployment of the "star wars" system. As a result of the first stage, 3,200 combat space platforms capable of carrying small homing missiles, as well as stations equipped with radar and special sensors, are to appear in space. To this end, according to U.S. Defense Department estimates, it will be necessary to carry out approximately 600 space launches over a 3-year period. According to the American TIME magazine, various SDI devices with a total weight of approximately 1.2 million kg will have to be put into space during the first year alone. In all, the "star wars" program will require up to 5,000 flights by space shuttles.

According to the Pentagon's scheme, the space-strike arms now being created [sozdavat] are to possess a wide series of properties peculiar to them alone.
It is a question of almost instantaneously hitting targets at vast distances of up to 1,000 km.

Certain American specialists consider chemical lasers the most promising for installation on combat space platforms. Such a laser resembles a working jet engine: The working chemical mixture is pumped through a resonator at supersonic speed. Some of the energy given off during the chemical reaction can be obtained in the form of directed streams of electromagnetic radiation in the optical band. A system of mirrors and resonance chambers gathers this energy into a narrow directed beam.

The United States has recently begun devoting more attention to free electron lasers. In devices of this type a beam of high-energy electrons is obtained in a special accelerator.

A special place in the American "star wars" program is occupied by the nuclear-pumped x-ray laser, which, according to a statement by E. Teller, "father of the hydrogen bomb," is the "most innovative and potentially most fruitful" of all weapons systems. According to the latest estimates, $200 million will be spent on work on the x-ray laser in fiscal 1986. The x-ray laser, so the foreign press reports, is one of the reasons why the White House refuses to subscribe to the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union, since this work requires underground nuclear explosions to be conducted.

Intensive work is also being carried out to create [sozdaniye] another type of strike weapon -- a beam weapon, whose operation is based on the use of beams of high-energy particles (electrons, protons).

There is also another avenue of research. It is a question of "electromagnetic mass accelerators," or "electromagnetic cannons." An experimental model of such a cannon by the name of (Dzhidi) has been created [sozdat] in laboratories at the University of

Texas Electromechanics Center. During tests a spherical "shell" weighing approximately 150 grams was fired at an initial velocity of 5 km per second. It is believed possible to increase the shells' initial velocity to 45 km per second -- which, foreign commentators point out, will be able to make this weapon more effective than missiles when used in space. Work is currently being carried out on another version of an electromagnetic cannon 39 meters long, which has been named (Dzhidi)-2. Such major military-industrial corporations as Boeing, Ford Aerospace and Communications, and General Dynamics are employed on developing [razrabotka] space electromagnetic cannons in the United States.

While working intensively on "new kinetic" weapons, the Pentagon is not abandoning "classic" schemes. As long as laser and beam weapons have not been created [sozdat] and there is still no possibility of putting electromagnetic cannons into series production, the Pentagon argues, it is important not to slacken the pace and to "lard" the earth and space with conventional missiles. These include small missiles with radar or infrared homing heads.

All this shows on what a wide front the United States is conducting work on creating [sozdaniye] weapons for "star wars." Some people in Washington clearly reckon that, by beginning the phased militarization of space in the next few years and relying on the mythical "technological superiority," the United States will be able to upset the military strategic equilibrium in its favor and will secure the possibility of committing nuclear aggression with impunity.

This is why the Pentagon is struggling so persistently to "legalize" the conducting of practical tests and "experiments" within the framework of the "star wars" program. This is why it is so opposed to the Soviet proposal to strengthen the regime of the ABM treaty -- a proposal that includes the sides' pledges to strictly observe the limitations envisaged by it.

In conclusion, let us recall the frankly cynical admission by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger: "If we are able to acquire a system that is efficient and that makes the Soviet Union's arms inefficient, we will return to the situation when we were the only country to possess nuclear weapons." The Soviet Union's position regarding the apologists for "star wars" was clearly formulated in the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev on Soviet television. Here, too, let them not reckon on intimidating us or pushing us into needless expenditure. If necessary, we will quickly find an answer, and it will not be what the United States expects. But it will be an answer that will make the "star wars" program worthless. The world's peoples are awaiting for the American Administration to finally display a sense of realism and respond positively to the Soviet call for the crazy arms race to be curbed on earth and in space.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS SUCCESSFUL U.S. ASAT SPACE TEST

LD230928 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0510 GMT 23 Aug 86

[Text] Washington, 23 Aug (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports: The United States carried out another test of the ASAT antisatellite system on Friday.

An official Pentagon spokesman reported that after taking off from Edwards Air Force Base in California, an F-15 fighter rose to a great altitude and launched an interceptor missile, fitted with an infrared guidance system, at a notional target in space. According to the Pentagon spokesman's statement, the test was successful. This already is the fourth test of the ASAT aircraft-and-missile antisatellite complex since 1984.

The House of Representatives adopted an amendment to a military appropriations bill last week banning ASAT tests at real targets in space. However, without waiting for that bill's final endorsement, the Pentagon planned three tests for 1987 of the ASAT antisatellite system at a real target in outer space. Reporting this, UPI emphasizes that "two targets already have been put into orbit."

Further development and testing of the ASAT system is one of the central directions in the present administration's military policy, which aims to prepare to wage war from space. Stubbornly refusing to agree to the Soviet proposed moratorium on the deployment of antisatellite weapons in space, the White House is allocating a large place in the star wars program to this system. As previously indicated by prominent U.S. experts, ASAT technology and the work being carried out within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" are so closely interconnected that curtailment of the testing of the anitsatellite system will lead to a slow-down in the development of components of the star wars program.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV CRITICIZES LATEST U.S., ASAT TEST

OW281041 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Aug 86

[Vsevolod Solovyev commentary; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The United States has recently carried out a routine test of its ASAT antisatellite system.

[Solovyev] Hello comrades, the recent test was the fourth to be conducted by the Pentagon within the framework of work connected with the development [sozdaniye] of a second-generation ASAT antisatellite system. This system is intended for destroying targets in near-earth orbit.

It is known that at the last round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva, the Soviet Union offered the United States to come to an agreement on partial measures that could be adopted now, each of which could make a significant contribution to solving the problem of preventing the militarization of space. This package of measures includes prohibiting antisatellite systems. Incidentally, it has now been 3 years since the Soviet Union has unilaterally not placed antisatellite weapons in space.

Judging from everything, the Soviet proposals made in Geneva appear not to suit the Pentagon at all for the following reasons: first, perfecting weapons against satellites is directly connected with the realization of the Pentagon's favorite creation, the SDI program: second, the testing and development [razvitiye] of antisatellite weapons make it possible to develop [razrabotka] antimissile technology under the limitations envisaged in the antimissile defense treaty, the ABM Treaty. For this reason the ASAT program is the Pentagon's loophole enabling the United States to circumvent this exceptionally important treaty. Finally, antisatellite weapons are instruments capable of undermining the other side's capability to carry out a return strike, a retribution strike. The Pentagon has announced that the latest test, the fourth test, of the ASAT system, was successful. But can another step leading toward the militarization of space be considered as success?

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

INTERNATIONAL FORUM EXPRESSES 'ANXIETY' OVER SDI

LD011751 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 1 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo, 1 Aug, TASS--TASS correspondent Sergey Logachev reports: Participants in the international forum for banning nuclear weapons, now under way in Tokyo, expressed their profound anxiety over the preparation for "Star Wars" launched by the U.S. ruling quarters. It has been sponsored by the representative Japanese peace organization Solidarity of Movement for Liquidating Nuclear Weapons. Scientists from various countries who addressed today's meeting, pointed out that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" had nothing to do with defensive aims and was a continuation of the U.S. aggressive nuclear doctrine.

Jim Falk, professor of the Australian University in Wollong, said that the Washington administration was stubbornly railroading the SDI's implementation. U.S. military laboratories are speeding up work on developing space weapons started long before President Reagan declared his space war strategy. Its implementation, the Australian scientist said, would undermine the Soviet-U.S. agreements preventing the arms race from getting out of hand.

It is a duty of specialists to drive home to the public at large the great danger the SDI brings to mankind, said Ioshio Ogava, professor of the Japanese Rikkyo Daigaku University. Japanese scientists do not stand aloof, making their contribution to the struggle against the threat of space militarization.

This is confirmed by a meeting between a group of young Japanese physicists and Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone which took place on Thursday. They demanded that the government declare Japan's non-participation in the "Star Wars" programme. Scientists from 21 major universities of the country put their signatures under this document.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV'S 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM DISCUSSES SDI

OW231021 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0453 GMT 23 Aug 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio; with Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades, we meet you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center for our regular discussion on current problems in world politics. Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, will take part in the discussion.

Major events, major processes taking place under our eyes often are not evaluated quickly in the proper measure, proper scale, and proper extent.

I think this is happening now. An extremely important, extremely significant process is going on right under our very eyes. It could be designated a change in the world political agenda. The issues and problems appear to be the same as those of the previous agenda. The scale of the formulation of these problems, the approach to them, their examination in the most complicated interconnections and interrelationships have now fundamentally changed. The principal world problems are now practically formulated anew and in a new fashion.

The latest example of this is the package of ideas, assessments, and proposals submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his 18 August television address.

The crux of these proposals, as you know, is the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions, now in its second year, until 1 January 1987. So the matter is not just about a new and important Soviet political step but -- and I am not afraid of this definition — about a decision on a revolutionary order. Over decades, the confronting sides have proposed ideas and discussed various foreign political concepts; now the Soviet Union is implementing a practical, most important, and very major measure requiring great courage and political farsightedness. The world has been given a truly historic chance to end the arms race.

I stress and emphasize that the matter is not about a single step but a whole package of measures, a full program demonstrating a completely new approach to the problems of the current world. Do you agree with this formulation of the issue?

[Shishlin] Well, I think that it is really so now.

[Zorin] Do you agree too?

[Sagdeyev] Of course. I think all this is supported by a detailed analysis of how we approached this critical point and what we brought to it.

[Zorin] Well, we will deal with this today. But before we begin our discussion on the subject, I would like to ask you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, to outline this new approach and describe its concrete contents.

[Shishlin] I would like to begin with an example. I am thinking about whether the Soviet Union could resume nuclear testing after the moratorium, which we have extended three times, expires. I think we have had political, defense, and moral motives for resuming nuclear testing, but to act thus would have meant to follow the pattern. Non-standard, bold, and farsighted actions were precisely what was needed in the new world with a new agenda.

If one side runs a red light and the other side follows its example, naturally a universal accident will occur. The new approach truly requires nonstandard and nonroutine solutions. The important point is that when we examine all the actions of our country over the last few months and even longer — I mean the large-scale comprehensive proposals for eliminating nuclear armaments, and for extending cooperation and reciprocal action consolidating security in the Asia-Pacific ocean region, I will not enumerate all these steps, we find one thing: These proposals are very specific, well-thought-out, and take into consideration the point of view of other social forces, other political circles. At the same time these proposals do not bear the character of an ultimatum.

That is also a substantial trait of the new approach, but there is something else. While announcing its initiatives, the Soviet Union offers something more than a dialogue, more than just a discussion. It proposes joint actions and joint decisions, and that is a very important point. By the way, it is precisely on joint actions in solving the most difficult problems connected with consolidating international security that the possibility of holding a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting depends.

[Zorin] In his television address, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, characterizing the motives for our new approach to world problems, formulated them briefly and precisely — the realities of the nuclear space era. These realities have many aspects and I would like your opinion, Roald Zinnurovich, a prominent scientist-physicist, on where these realities lie.

[Sagdeyev] Speaking briefly, these realities lie in the fact that today mankind possesses a nuclear arsenal with power equivalent to several tens of thousands of megatons of conventional explosives, thousands of missiles, and other delivery vehicles; and speaking crudely, mankind now has the potential to destroy itself several times over by pushing a button.

[Zorin] Well, the reality is impressive on the whole, I would say. In this connection I would like to return to the question about the moratorium. When you look at the U.S. position, you see that the Soviet Union's moratorium has, so far at any rate, aroused a fairly negative assessment in Washington, although in the rest of the world this step has been assessed as one of primary political significance. Roald Zinnurovich, I would like you to assess this step from the physicist's point of view.

[Sagdeyev] The moratorium is an unusually bold step. It is an act that aims in its first very important stage to completely stop all types of nuclear tests on earth. What will this signify from the point of view of that huge arsenal of arms already stockpiled? It would mean that a barrier would be dropped on the further qualitative growth of these weapons, the emergence [poyavleniye] of new and more accurate warheads with additional destructive properties, because in order to creat any new and real types of weapons and new warheads testing is needed, practical testing in the final stage to qualify this terrible weapon of destruction for production. These practical tests would be prohibited once and for all. Further, this involves the whole chain of other types of armaments connected with the warheads -- for instance delivery vehicles -- new delivery vehicles that are more insidious, accurate, and destabilizing. To test them it would be necessary to link them with an already proven [otrabotannaya] new nuclear warhead. This would also be made considerably more difficult. Analysis shows that the qualitative nuclear arms race could essentially exhaust itself.

[Zorin] So this apparently simple step could truly stop the nuclear arms race?

[Sagdeyev] The race in the qualitative aspect.

[Zorin] I understand. That is the physicist's point of view. What about the political viewpoint, Nikolay Vladimirovich?

[Shishlin] I am afraid you know the political view, yet I would like to say that of course, an accounting of strategic armaments or intermediate range armaments is not a simple matter, it is objectively difficult. Yet this is an absolutely clear step -- ending nuclear testing -- that adds an element in international relations of which we are in very short supply, and that is in the field of confidence. Today's world is poisoned with suspicious, fear, and hatred. The Soviet moratorium is not only a sign of courage, it is also an aspiration to realize this courage, to produce practical tangible things that can be understood by both political leaders and scientists and by an ordinary man and every country.

[Zorin] It seems to me that the star wars problem is very closely related to the problem of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, because many people in the United States explain the rejection of the moratorium, an unwillingness to follow it, by the fact that it is difficult to develop important SDI systems without it.

Therefore, I think we should dwell on this problem now. This program is called star wars but Washington stubbornly prefers the term SDI -- Strategic Defense Initiative -- stressing defense and attaching to it not simply some external camouflage but also the idea that there is some kind of change in military doctrine involved. Before, there was talk of developing offensive kinds of weapons whereas now, you see, they are concerned only with defense.

Ronald Zinnurovich, you are a specialist on these problems so the cards are in your hand, so to speak.

[Sagdeyev] If we speak about whether this concept has a purely defensive character, I can cite a very simple and obvious example. Is reinforcing a tank's armor a defensive act? I think everyone would answer no, unequivocally. It would strengthen the power of the tank as a strike weapon.

[Shishlin interrupting] And its invulnerability.

[Sagdeyev] And its invulnerability. In fact, all these arguments are fully applicable to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Moreover, the main elements, the technical innovations being used in the SDI concept, are direct means for offensive strikes [sredstva proazheniya]. They are small powerful missiles designed to overtake nuclear relatiatory means -- the ICBM's -- and destroy them. In other words, this is primarlily a kill capability. It also includes powerful laser and a wide range of about a dozen various exotic systems.

Now this kill capability of echelons of the Strategic Defence Initiative, first and foremost, can put out of action identical echelons if the opposing side decides to create them in space -- the symmetrical echelons of the potential enemy. As mathematicians say, we are back where we started.

[Zorin] By the way, Roald Zinnurovich, is there really a link between nuclear tests and the star wars program? Are they really essential to the implementation of this program?

[Sagdeyev] One of the exotic options in the technical solution of the star wars problem is linked with the use of a very narrow, intense, and powerful laser beam along which intense X-ray radiation can be channeled. In order to create this beam, according to calculations and some observations, it is necessary to explode a medium-sized nuclear charge. In other words, it means that new warheads are needed that must be exploded in space.

[Zorin] I understand. Now Roald Zinnurovich, I want to ask you a question that may be somewhat awkward for you to answer, but it comes to mind and should be answered. Our specialists, including you and your colleagues, as well as leading U.S. specialists have said a lot about the SDI program being unrealistic in view of the current level of knowledge and existing technology, that it cannot be created today.

On the other hand, we are all talking about the danger of this program, we are actively opposing it. How can we reconcile these things?

[Sagdeyev] The SDI program, in the form in which it is being publicized, seems to me and to most scientists, including U.S. scientists, to be completely unrealistic. This is linked with the fact that nuclear weapons -- this latest product of human genius predicted to self-destruction -- have already reached such a degree of destructiveness that to create a meaningful defense would mean to practically exclude the penetration of even single nuclear charges. Against a background of 10,000 or 20,000 simultaneously incoming warheads it is practically impossible to block them all. This has been shown by calculations that take into consideration the accuracy and the kill capability of antimissile defenses and calculations that take into consideration the capabilities of computers to manage the process of sucha hypothetical global conflict.

Therefore, if the other side opposes this kind of defense by further increasing offensive systems, penetration of the lines of defense will become a much simplier matter and, as other arguments have shown, this direction is economically more advantageous.

[Zorin] On the basis of letters we have received from you, comrade television viewers, I would like to ask you, Roald Zinnurovich, two questions: First of all, television viewers ask about the degree of danger in the star wars program to us, to our country, and to our allies. Can we effectively oppose this danger? That is one

question. The second one -- I would like to hear the answer precisely from you, a specialist in your field -- is: Is it essential for us to oppose the U.S. star wars program with something similar, something equivalent, or something symmetrical?

[Sagdeyev] If we talk about the degree of danger to us, then these arguments about the global destructive and penetrating nature of weapons remain in force. It is very difficult and practically impossible to create an ideal defense against incoming nuclear warheads, and a whole series of additional methods and technical developments exist. I must say that in the past few years there has been an intensive exchange of views and assessments in meetings between concerned scientists, public figures, and military figures, and a series of such methods has been placed on the agenda.

If we talk about what side b's retaliatory reaction can be to the actions of side a over the creation of an antimissible space shield, there are various options available. For example, it seems to me that the mirror option that would be analogous -- using chess terminology -- to the well-known opening play called the Russian gambit could in this case, the Russian gambit I mean, could be the least profitable play, because the appearance in space of two symmetrical shields would create additional instabilities, for example, the destruction of one shield by the other.

After all, these are systems, space echelons flying alongside one another in near-earth orbits, and each one of these systems would possess an enormous explosive charge [ognevoy zaryad], a charge that according to the designer's plan would be sufficient to destroy the entire system of nuclear retribution, the retaliatory nuclear missile blow. In other words, many thousand of missiles and warheads. Therefore, the destruction of the neighboring object is simply a harmless activity -- the neighboring object being possibly several dozen or even hundreds of these enormous, ungainly, and vulnerable SDI stations.

There are other arguments showing that science and technology possess means to penetrate SDI, to suppress defense echolons, and to saturate it using a variety of methods. Take for example space mines [kosmicheskiye miny].

They are relatively small and seemingly harmless devices that can silently move in orbit and come in contact with these dangerous destabilizing star wars stations at the necessary moment.

Why are we talking about this? Why are we warning against this kind of development of events? Because the launching into orbit at first of enormous star wars echelons, then of various means for ensuring combat against these echelons -- these are another round after round of the arms race. It means delaying -- possibly irreversibly -- the question of a political solution to the question of how to get rid of this gigantic arsenal that has been accumulated on earth.

[Shishlin] Excuse me, Valentin Sergeyevich, I was quite captivated by these opinions and I thought that it is probably justifiable to contemplate why the United States continues to cling to SDI? In this regard I think that the idea expressed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement about the aim of the United States being threefold -- profit, and illusory hope to achieve military superiority, and finally a desire to exhaust the Soviet Union economically -- is what dictates, the latter possibly the most, these massive military programs, including the star wars program.

Therefore we must think about what we need. Obviously under these conditions we need a strong defense. This is unequivocal, and we have it. However, we need to have in similar measure a strong foreign policy that is consistent and peace-loving and guided by new approaches, nonstandard approaches to this genuinely new world political agenda. And undoubtedly we need successful realization of the strategy of acceleration. Although this is not the only response to SDI, it is the best.

[Zorin] If I have understood you correctly, and you Roald Zinnurovich in particular, we naturally strive to prevent any race in space; but if it is imposed on us, we do not have to build such bulky and expensive systems in order to make them effective. If I have understood you correctly, our science has its own constructive ideas in this field, is that so?

[Sagdeyev] I think that now at the stage of introduction, when the new political thinking is emerging, it is very indicative in this aspect. All, maybe not all, but some basic counteractive measures are being widely discussed. They are discussed not only at meetings of scientists and political leaders, but also discussed fairly publicly at other political forums. Various U.S. experts at the request of senators and congressmen give their assessments about the extent of the danger presented by SDI and how to counteract it. These assessments are widely publicized.

In this regard our scientists have their own ideas [zadumki], and we have shared some of these ideas during similar discussions. I think that this shows that though we have in reserve various methods for counteraction, the main task of our country is to prevent this new and dangerous destabilizing turn in the arms race.

[Zorin] Here we have a question that cannot fail to emerge. Washington is suffering very obvious political damage throughout the world for refusing to join the Soviet moratorium over many months and insisting on implementing the star wars program, in the technical implementation of which many things are not clear.

On the whole star wars is not a very American way of thinking. The Americans are known -- I have had to deal for many years with this country -- to be very pragmatic people.

They will never dig in their purse to pay for something if they are not 100 percent sure of its value.

[Shishlin, interrupting] It happens in America that state leaders with idealistic beliefs can be found.

[Zorin] That is correct, but I am talking about the national way of thinking. Americans are pragmatists, and in this case they are ready, or are getting ready, to spend trillions of dollars -- as the program is in terms of trillions and not billions -- for this star wars program and the question -- what is the matter? -- cannot fail to emerge. What is happening? The answer to this question was very clearly given by Mikhail Sergeyevich in his television address when he said that the powerful U.S. militarist group representing the military-industrial complex has simply gone mad over the arms race. This is not a metaphor. It is a statement of fact on what is actually happening. The arms race has provided only several dozen large cooperations for 30 or 35 years huge profits from the implementation of long-term, and large volume military programs. Now specialists have calculated that the military-industrial complex will manage to receive profits in full for another 3 or 4 years. Then these profits will begin to diminish quickly. This has already been mentioned on television, but this is so substantial that it is worthwhile to remind you once more. These profits will begin

to decrease, but the military-industrial complex needs more than instant profits, more than what it can obtain this year. It needs long-term programs. And this is where the SDI program came to the rescue. It will provide enormous long-term profits, over 2 to 3 decades for the military-industrial complex that apparently plays a decisive role in Washington's negative position with respect to the Soviet proposals, which we still have to face.

Now I would like to ask you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, a question that at first glance, especially in our auditorium may appear very simple while actually it has deep implications. Why is it that it is precisely we, why is it our country, that comes out at this truly, critical point of human history, with a program for saving mankind from the threat of nuclear destruction?

[Shishlin] I agree, Valentin Sergeyevich, that the answer to this question may seem to be superficial. But whatever it is, superficial or not, the answer actually does not lose its truth. There is an American economist of Russian descent, Wasiliy Leontief, a 1983 Nobel Prize winner in economics. He recently wrote in a magazine and made the following observation. He says that capitalists are full of ideas, dynamism, and that they are not very competent when long-term and global thinking is needed. He asks, why? Because the entrepreneur looks only at profits and does not see beyond his nose.

Valentin Sergeyevich, you said that they envision profits 3 decades ahead. There is enough intelligence for that, but a shortage of competence to evaluate the existing situation as it appears now, the realities of the nuclear space age.

With us, the development of production -- now the object of the reorganization of our country and our economy -- is subordinated to conducting a strong social policy. For this reason it is expected from the socialist method of production, from the Soviet Union as a socialist country, to have proportionality and its system of priorities. This is the reason the Soviet Union speaks about judicious sufficiency. That is why the Soviet Union, without neglecting its own security interests, thinks that in the interest of the United States as well as the entire world, it is possible and necessary to ensure international security at an immeasurably lower level of armaments and to proceed further toward the affirmation of coexistence as a universal principle in international relations.

There is another substantial detail. We must feel and understand that we are constantly pushed and provoked to shift to old ruts. We are constantly urged to act according to the principle of an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.

The Soviet Union is now sufficiently strong and possesses sufficient political, defensive, scientific, technical, and moral potential to behave in a new way and to offer these new routes to a peaceful tomorrow.

[Zorin] Roald Zinnurovich, I will tell you a secret. I waited a long time to meet you, to meet you here, in order to publicly ask you a difficult question. I do not think I am not the only one to be worried by it. Here is what is happening. Mankind is moving along a line of ascent. You scientists are a kind of motor in this progress of mankind. Nevertheless, over decades -- I do not want to say a longer period -- it turns out that the attainments of the human spirit and mind are sort of marked by some kind of ill fate. There is some kind of ill fate hanging over it. What should have made mankind happy, the new knowledge you work and your talents bring to mankind, that you place in its depository, this knowledge conceals terrible threats for mankind. The world is now coming face to face with this. I would like to ask Academician Sagdeyev

why science, of which you are a representative, cannot protect the people from the consequences of their own knowledge and discoveries, and what is this ill-fated combination or progress and danger?

[Sagdeyev] I do not think it is a matter of just the last decades. If you turn to the history of scientific development, the history of its emergence, we could say that science is a kind of method for ordering man's experiences in communion and study of nature, himself, and society. In this respect it is possible to go far back into history. Let us take Archimedes, for instance. It is known that from time to time Archimedes made inventions of a military character, intended for the defense, as he thought, of his own city of Syracuse. In the history of man, from time to time there appeared some inventions as side products of scientific-technical progress or as direct products of direct research, which were new kinds of means of defense, protection, and attack. The progress of military technology has always moved in step with science.

[Zorin interrupts] But it never threatened the fate of mankind until recently.

[Sagdeyev] It is not a question of some portent hanging overhead in the last few decades, but that we have come close to the ill-fated line when the opportunities that science shared with mankind -- opportunities for using new sources of energy and other opportunities -- these Archimedes' levers have now influenced mankind and the environment so much that we have really come to the ill-fated line. It is not ill fate but an ill-fated line. And we have come to it from many positions at once and this may not be accidential. At first it was thought that this is all the result of the revolution in atomic physics. But now we see that relatively instantaneously, during a few decades, these discoveries in atomic nuclear physics were supplemented with unprecendented progress in rocket technology, and this has given rise to the realities of the nuclear space age. Other sciences are now in the same position. Let us remember genetic engineering.

In addition, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted, the agenda now includes issues which do not appear to be connected with the military line in scientific or technical research, but simply linked to the change of the character of man's activities on earth. These are global issues, issues of ecology, protection of the world oceans, sources of food, new peaceful sources of energy, and so forth.

I think that all the experiences in human development have shown and actually the scientists have never denied it and they have spoken about it loudly. [as heard] Let us remember the Einstein-Russell manifesto, let us remember what Niels Bohr said during his last years, that science cannot solve all these problems. It can reveal some laws of nature, laws of the micro or macro world, indicate where new levers are hidden. But science cannot tell us how to correctly use these levers and compel man to follow precisely along the road of their correct use.

It is no accident that some of the most far-sighted scientists as early as 1945, that is 40 years ago, said that there might be a revolution in atomic physics and natural sciences which will undoubtedly be accompanied by a revolution in moral principles and in the political thinking of man.

[Shislin] Roald Zinnurovich, it seems to me that what you have said is very correct. There is no simple answer to the not so simple question asked by Valentin Sergeyevich. It really requires thought not only of a scientific-technical character, and not only of a philosophical character, but also of a political character, and very correctly, of a moral-ethical character. This aspect was given very great attention in Mikhail

Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. I have a very substantial and fairly bitter observation that scientific-technical progress is ahead of social and moral progress. I wish it were the other way. Unfortunately this occurs with us too and not only with the country that is trying to impress us. All the complicated and difficult history with the plan for diverting part of the flow of Siberian and northern rivers to the south is sufficiently well known. As you know, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo made the decision to stop the project. On the whole, that is a very serious lesson both for science and technology and also politics and morality. In this sense it seems to me that Walt Whitman, a remarkable American poet, wrote fairly distinctly and clearly a long, long time ago before our days. [sentence as heard] He wrote that all the people of the world are sailing on the same voyage and that their destination or their aim was one. In this case you must not think that Whitman held some kind of dark vision. He believed that people seek happiness, harmony, cooperation, and brotherhood. The crux of the matter is that this road cannot be covered along. This is precisely why the Soviet Union supports freeing interstate relations from ideological bias and is for cooperation.

[Zorin] I would like to return from the bright colors you have arrived at to the realities of today and to the assertion that the level of mankind's knowledge has given rise to enormous dangers that all mankind faces and which politicians are striving to resolve. Having said this I would like to ask you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, the question: What is the way out of the present situation?

[Shishlin] Well, Valentin Sergeyevich, first of all, of course, the Soviet Union, Soviet leadership, and Soviet society are not so supercilious as to maintain that we have already caught the bird by the tail. But I think we have more than sufficient grounds to say it is precisely the Soviet Union and our party that developed and deciphered at the April plenum of the Central Committee and then at the 27th Congress, as well as in a whole series of large-scale initiatives what it is that we contribute to the term "new thinking". But here not only this deciphering of practical actions is important, although I think it is extremely significant. I think that it is very important to correctly assess and correctly understand the fundamental political conclusions that lie precisely at the basis of the Soviet state's practical actions. First, and this is what we talk about and what we write about, and what party documents point out, a contradictory but mutually dependent world is developing before our eyes, an integral world.

If the first part was accented to a certain extent before, that is, the contradictions of the world -- and this remains -- then the accent now is being placed predominantly on the second part, on mutual dependence. Second, I think that a capital element of the new thinking is the conclusion of our state and party that security should be equal, mutual, and universal.

This is why all the Soviet proposals are founded on a regard for the interests of the security of our country, the security of the United States, and the security of other states. Now Roald Zinnurovich, I would like to compete with you and also cite Niels Bohr. He said that usually the truth is opposed by lies and profound truth is opposed by even more profound truth. It seems to me that the contrasting nature of the two social systems and the competition and struggle between them is a truth, a genuinely profound truth. But the conclusion that we must learn to live together, learn to live in peace, learn to coexist, and learn to cooperate is an even more profound truth.

An assertion of the new thinking, generally, demands -- and we are forced to return to this time and time again and this was mentioned in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement -- a breakthrough to confidence. And there is no other road here other than the road of military detente. Herein lies the exclusive significance of the Soviet decision to extend the moratorium.

[Zorin] I want to dwell on a problem that we have touched on briefly. In his television address Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that an exacerbation of global issues is also characteristic of the world today. They cannot be resolved without uniting the efforts of all states and peoples. The mastering of space and the ocean depths, ecology and epidemics, poverty and backwardness. All of these realities of the age demand international attention, international responsibility, and international cooperation.

Roald Zinnurovich, you are forced to deal directly with problems that require this kind of international cooperation. What can you say about this?

[Sagdeyev] Very often I must talk with my foreign colleagues and this includes the topics of mankind's future and the role of science. I have to relate bitterly that in recent decades the level of financing of science by military departments has sharply increased. In the United States it is often repeated that 90 percent of science is financed today through the Pentagon. In this sense the role of a scientist, the position of a scientist today can be compared with Faust, who in order to engage in his beloved science, sold his soul to Mephistopheles.

A group of Soviet and foreign scientists gathered in Moscow in mid-July at a forum on stopping nuclear tests. We met Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We told him about the scientists' concern, about arguments in favor of stopping tests, about the evaluation of the role of the moratorium. There was also talk about what science is supposed to be concerned with, how science itself should help mankind correct this bias [perekos] toward the military field. Mikhail Sergeyevich, in his address to us said: Is it necessary to justify SDI, this grandiose military program, by saying that in the end science will obtain some additional side results? Is it not possible to simply formulate these scientific tasks, these so-called side effects -- like global problems facing mankind, the problem of space exploration, the problem of mastering the use of new sources of energy -- as fundamental problems and solve them jointly?

All experience in the development of our science shows that we welcome the biggest and the most far-reaching joint international projects.

The large group of scientists and engineers which recently completed the realization of the "Vega" project, the encounter with Halley's comet, noted with satisfaction that within the framework of our project they managed to attract fairly considerable forces of the international scientific community. It is no accident that this project was discussed again during Mikhail Sergeyevich's meeting with scientists attending the forum.

We are now preparing to realize the next space project, a project called phobos More extensive international cooperation is involved in this project. In fact, world science and Soviet science, as a leading detachment group in world science, can shoulder considerably more important and bigger tasks.

[Shishlin] Roald Zinnurovich, it seems to me that the global problems you have mentioned, including energy, space, ecology, oceans, and oceanology are usually examined separately, while in fact they are all mutually interconnected, and should not be examined separately. I shall use something that it is closer to, the political problems of the Third World. Let us say that we find a miraculous cure and the Third World does away with foreign debts which are a heavy burden.

And what can you do with regional conflicts? What can be done with the hunger problem, all that ocean of poverty? It simply is not possible to really cope singly with these global problems including economic, scientific, technical, and political problems. They will be half solutions, partial solutions. And this is why it is so important to achieve some regulation of international relations on the basis of recognition of realities of the nuclear space age and on the basis of an understanding that on this earth, this wonderful planet, people can do much for their own good.

[Zorin] Well, we have talked about new thinking, and some consider this a fine wish. At the same time you two have enumerated a whole number of problems facing mankind, which must be solved if mankind is to develop any further, and which cannot be solved by any separate state, or nation. So here is ground on which will objectively grow the shoots of new thinking. Even if new thinking is not done by those in the White House or other official offices now, the tasks facing mankind will objectively engender new thinking. Nevertheless, I would like to say that our position is very clear and manifest on this issues. Unfortunately it is also a reality that on the other side today -- not sometime in the future, as I said, but today -- a quite different point of view is very influential. In order to have a fruitful dialogue to solve a problem you need not just one side but two sides. Well what can you say on this issue, Roald Zinnurovich?

[Sagdeyev] A whole series of far-reaching concrete proposals on solving major international and global problems and realizing major projects, not only space-oriented ones but the most diverse ones, are already being put forward at the level of initiative groups of scientists, individual public organizations, and scientific unions. It is no coincidence that scientists are directing these concrete proposals to their governments and their peoples.

I think that if reason triumphs, if success is achieved in uniting in equal proportions sober new political thinking with scientific achievement, mankind will manage to solve both the task of survival and the task of saving our planet and man's environment for future generations.

[Zorin] Roald Zinnurovich, are you an optimist?

[Sagdeyev] I would like to be an optimist.

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, what can you say?

[Shishlin] Of course you need two sides for a dialogue, but I will make a small remark first, that the statement made by the CPSU General Secretary now was not addressed only to the United States. Although to some extent it was addressed primarily to the United States, it was addressed to the whole world. We are talking about a dialogue in which all states participate, all countries on the globe, I would add a dialogue in which not only politicians, journalists,and scientists take part, but all people both of good will or partial good will, take part.

It seems to me that in this dialogue, which will undoubtedly intensify and which has intensified considerably under the influence of the latest statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, a common denominator for the interests of mankind can be found.

Of course, Roald Zinnurovich, I am convinced that this does not mean only survival, although survival is irrefutably the main thing; and undoubtedly the most important thing is to save the environment of the human race. But I think it is simply very important to learn to cooperate. When will this be? It is probably impossible to say now, although it should be today, or at least tomorrow, because the day after tomorrow it may be too late. Now insofar as this stems from the objective needs of human civilization and the objective requirements of the world's social development it seems we have grounds to expect than both the words of the Soviet leadership and the actions of our country will bring about the necessary results in the long run.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air has run out. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our discussion and our television viewers for their attention. So until we meet again here in our Studio 9. Thank you.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PAPER EXAMINES AIMS, COST, FEASIBILITY OF SDI

PM150908 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Aug 86 p 3

[Senior Engineer Ye. Tumanova interview with SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants under the rubric "Dialogue With a Reader": "SDI Has Its Sights Trained on Peace" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] We are continuing our dialogue with readers on the most important problems of world politics. SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants answers questions from Ye. Tumanova (Alma-ata), senior engineer at the Kazenergonaladka Republic Specialized Enterprise.

[Tumanova] Our press and the foreign press have published a great deal of criticisms in connection with R. Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." I would like to know what arguments SDI proponents are now resorting to in the face of such worldwide criticism of their program.

[Dadyants] I recall that from the outset the SDI program was tightly bound up in peace-making demagoguery. In his first "star wars" speech back in March 1983 President Reagan claimed that it was a question of creating a system which would "remove the nuclear threat once and for all." Even now people stubbornly persist in calling the "star wars" program "defensive." And, of course, the need for "defense" is justified by references to a mythical "Soviet threat" and fabrications that since the seventies the USSR has allegedly been engaged in an "active, large-scale buildup of its military potential." Moreover, Americans must believe that the Russians have already created some kind of "red shield" in order to defend themselves from U.S. missiles; and now the United States, the claim, is completely defenseless in the face of the "perfidious and aggressive Russians."

All this base demagoguery is aimed at lamebrains from the American backwoods. And Reagan and his entourage do not bother to argue with SDI's opponents, who have proved that the launching of the "star wars" program will actually mean a new spiral in the nuclear arms race and trigger a kind of chain reaction which will no longer be stoppable.

SDI is not an alternative but just a supplement to the aggressive U.S. offensive nuclear potential. It is aimed at providing Americans with a nuclear first-strike capability while disarming the enemy.

[Tumanova] The SDI program is often called a "fantasy." Could such a system actually be created or is it just a dream of the U.S. pretenders to world domination? Has anything already been done to implement the SDI program?

[Dadyants] It must be said that opinions on this score differ. D. (Parnas), an American professor who has specialized in computer science, has announced that he is leaving the staff of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization because he believes the goals it has set to be unrealistic. B. (Feld), a researcher from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, believes that "there are too many possibilities" that SDI will break down even if it is created. Even "pebbles and sand," he stated, would be enough to put the fragile systems in space out of action.

Just what is SDI? It is a 4-layer defense system against the missiles of a presumed enemy. If the missiles are not successfully destroyed on the ground before launch it is proposed to "intercept" them during the launch phase. If that does not succeed,then in he third and fourth stages it is planned to destroy warheads breaking through the defensive line before they hit their targets. All this requires exceptionally complex technological solutions: Hitherto, a Western newspaper wrote with some irony, they have "only functioned on the silver screen."

Nonetheless people are working -- and working actively -- on the "star wars" program. Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson, director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, states that "SDI is past the turbulent period that typifies the first years of the formation of all information of all important new initiatives." The Pentagon recently presented a report to Congress detailing the progress in implementing SDI in fiscal 1985. It claims that significant progress has been achieved in the sphere of developing various types of weapons and surveillance systems -- particularly in the sphere of the use of free electron directed-energy lasers and the creation of an electromagnetic gun as well as space-based weapons using kinetic energy. The most significant achievements in the last 2 years, the document states, was an in-flight missile interception by an autonomous [avtonomnyy] homing interceptor.

[Tumanova] What does all this work cost and who is carrying it out? How much have U.S. monopolies earned from it?

[Dadyants] Since Reagan's "star wars" speech 4.7 billion dollars have already been spend on SDI. The Strategic Defense Initiative Organization has asked Congress for 2,759 billion dollars for 1986 and 5,511 billion for 1987. In 1985 so-called "subcontractors" -- put simply, big shots in the U.S. military-industrial complex -- were granted around 1,000 contracts within the SDI framework. In all, according to THE WASHINGTON POST calculations, the cost of creating and servicing SDI will cost 770 billion dollars for the first 10 years. As you can see, U.S. corporations intend to make a tidy sum out of SDI.

[Tumanova] Your newspaper has already written that the United States is actively involving its NATO allies in SDI work. Why is this being done? Is there any sense in the U.S. monopolies "sharing the cake" with their allies?

[Dadyants] That is a very interesting question. Yes, the United States wants to mobilize the entire Western world -- including not only Western Europe but Japan too -- in deploying the SDI system. Not because U.S. corporations want to share the "cake" but simply because certain latest technologies needed for SDI have not been most fully developed in Western Europe and Japan. This applies, for instance, to laser beam focusing and guidance technology, in which the West Germans are ahead.

If you recall, C. Weinberger initially gave the allies an "ultimatum," proposing that they unconditionally join SDI. But the massive pressure did not work: Many West European countries did not want to tie themselves to a dangerous American venture. France categorically opposed SDI. The United States, then tried another tack -- persuading the allies in turn. Intergovernmental agreements with the United States

have now been signed by Britain, the FRG, and Israel. Italy and Japan are preparing to join SDI.

The many private Western firms are another matter. They, of course, are interested in SDI contracts. That is the nature of capitalism -- a capitalist is prepared to earn his corn from guns even if tomorrow they will be trained on him.

However, the West European companies' interest in the U.S. program should not be exaggerated. Leading West German electronics companies such as Siemens are taking a very cautious approach to SDI. The president of the firm has calculated that the FRG's electronics industry would earn at best 41 million dollars from the Americans by 1990. And in total the United States intends spending no more than 300 million dollars abroad over the next 5 years, that is, approximately 1 percent of the cost of its "research program." France's LE FIGARO called this "crumbs from a virtually exclusively American table."

[Tumanova] It is said that the implementation of SDI would signify tremendous progress in the development of not only military but also civil technologies. Is that so?

[Dadyants] No its isn't. Advanced technologies can be developed without military programs and even despite them. As for the "civil aspect" of SDI, simply nobody believes it. In its research West Germany's Industries Anlagen und Betriebsgesellschaft came to the conclusion that "cross-fertilization" [vzaimoobmen] between military and civil technologies can only be expected in the initial development phase; it subsequently becomes more and more difficult owing to the "entirely different goals." STERN magazine unambiguously believes that the aims of the SDI program are purely military and have no civil applications.

[Tumanova] It seems that the "star wars" program has become the main obstacle at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. Is there any way out of this deadlock?

[Dadyants] Yes, SDI can be called the stumbling block at the talks. That is even understood in the United States itself. Former Defense Secretary J. Schlesinger said: "By demanding that the Russians reduce their offensive arms at a time when we are presenting them with the possibility of an enormous buildup in U.S. defense potential, the administration has created a situation in which the Russians cannot meet the United States halfway even if they wanted to."

Nonetheless, M.S. Gorbachev has proposed a compromise: substantially reducing Soviet and U.S. strategic arms, simultaneously extending the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years, and limiting work on SDI to laboratory research -- the level which the United States has already reached.

How did the U.S. Administration respond to this? By proposing to postpone deployment of SDI for 5-7 years, and then to deploy it in space anyway.

This schedule suits the Americans, bearing in mind that it will be impossible to deploy SDI for at least 10 years.

The fact is that the U.S. military-industrial complex, having gotten its second wind in connection with SDI deployment, does not want to give up its billion-dollar profits. Political will is needed to overcome the military -industrial complex' resistance, and that will is to all appearances precisely what the U.S. Administration lacks.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COLONEL ON PERILS OF EDI AS 'EURO-SDI'

PM141752 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 32, 10 Aug 86 p 5

[Colonel Vladimir Chernyshev article: "Euro-SDI: A New Threat to the Old Continent"]

[Text] Authors and Stage Manager

In an interview with CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR on July 15, American General Bernard Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander of the NATO forces in Europe, called on the West European partners of the USA, besides taking part in the American Star Wars programme (SDI), to build an antimissile defence system of their own. The NATO Supreme Command, he said, had already approved the "basic principles" of the R and D programme for such a system.

U.S. spokesmen have long been prodding their allies towards the implementation of the so-called European Defence Initiative, or the Euro-SDI. A West European ABM system is fully consistent with the efforts of the American administration to implement its Star Wars programme. Washington has tried through Euro-SDI to secure from NATO countries more active support for the USA concerning the militarization of space, and to use the West European plans to "painlessly" draw into the American SDI even those countries which have refused to be officially committed to it.

The idea of setting up a full-scale antimissile "shield" over Western Europe was conceived in certain West European circles and in the United States itself. As early as 1982, Manfred Woerner, who was then the FRG Minister of Defence, was presented by his department with a special document compiled with the participation of the largest military-industrial concern Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm (MBB), which contained this very idea. Discussion on setting up a West European ABM system was especially acute after President Reagan announced the SDI programme.

The question of building Euro-SDI was discussed in the French-West German commission on security with the participation of representatives from the ministries of defence and foreign affairs of both countries, which met on June 20, 1985, in Paris. In an interview with the West German radio station Deutschlandfunk Charles Hernu, then French Minister of Defence, admitted that France was engaged in developing antimissile systems and would like other West European states, primarily the FRG, to join in with the research.

The ruling circles of the FRG immediately have been most active concerning the Euro-SDI. On September 27, 1985, the Bundestag deputies from the CDU/CSU submitted their proposals on European Defence Initiative to the Bundestag commission on questions of defence, and the Ministry of Defence hastened to announce its readiness to finance this plan. On Woerner's insistence, the question of the Euro-SDI was thrashed out on December 2, 1985, at a meeting of the NATO Eurogroup. The West German Minister of Defence also took up the issue of a West European ABM system at the spring (1986) session of the NATO nuclear planning group in Wuerzburg.

There are definite difficulties between the FRG and France concerning the Euro-SDI. In the opinion of the FRG's ruling circles, the Federal Republic could get access to the latest military technology through the SDI and Euro-SDI and thereby compensate for its lack of nuclear weapons, and advance further towards "military-strategic equality" with the other leading NATO countries. One NATO publication pointed out that "Bonn is pinning its hopes on having access to space antimissile weapons to close the 'nuclear gap' in its armed forces". Therefore Bonn would like to dovetail the Euro-SDI with the American SDI as a direct "appendage" to it, and to build the planned West European system mainly through the programmes of its own concerns. The West German politico-military leadership does not want France to be the major partner in realizing the Euro-SDI. In its opinion, this would have a negative effect on the FRG's relations not only with the USA, but with Britain.

On the other hand, Paris apprehends that the FRG, enjoying the greatest support from the USA, will get access to the most sophisticated technology and will subsequently have an even more important part to play in military questions and, consequently, in Western Europe and in NATO generally, which is by no means to France's liking.

However, all these differences, notwithstanding military cooperation between France and the FRG, is still expanding steadily. They are looking for a "common language" on the Euro-SDI as well. At the close of 1985 Chancellor Helmut Kohl suggested to President Francois Mitterrand that a joint commission be set up to examine cooperation in aircraft manufacturing and space development.. It should also draft the project for the Euro-SDI.

As we can see, the Euro-SDI idea has a collective body of authors, but the stage management of these dangerous plans is exclusive to one country -- across the ocean.

Propaganda Camouflage

The advocates of the Euro-SDI have given currency to several propaganda scenarios aimed at obscuring the true purport and orientation of their plans and the dangerous nature of bringing his idea into life.

Scenario One. The development of an antimissile defence system of their own would allegedly enable West European states to "gain independence" from the USA.

In fact, the American leadership hopes to turn the Euro-SDI into an appendage to the SDI. In an interview with the newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in November 1985, Rogers made it unequivocally clear that, as Americans see it, it can only be the question of a military-technical supplement to the SDI and that this additional system would be at his (Supreme Commander's) disposal. And at an international seminar in Munich (November 19, 1985) he said bluntly that the Euro-SDI should be carried out as a programme of mutual stimulation, not competition with the SDI.

In their statements U.S. spokesmen dub the Euro-SDI as a "side effect", an "offshoot", and "integrated component" of the American SDI. This view on the European plans also predetermined the condition advanced by official Washington -- the need for close cooperation between West Europeans and the USA.

In a talk with West German journalists on September 20, 1985, Richard Perle, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense, said that Washington would fully sympathize with Europeans if they ask the USA for help to design their own ABM system. In the autumn of 1985, the experts of the NATO headquarters worked out the question of developing a Euro-SDI and arrived at the conclusion that this project was "quite feasible" if the West European countries closely cooperated with the Americans in realizing the SDI. In the Italian newspaper CORRIERE DELLA SERA, Lord Carrington, NATO Secretary-General, urged the West Europeans to get down to developing antimissile defence by joint effort with the USA.

Scenario Two. Western Europe needs the Euro-SDI since otherwise, as a result of the implementation of the American SDI and the Soviet Union's reply measures, it would become a "zone of reduced security". The USA and the USSR, allegedly will be protected against a nuclear-missile strike whereas Washington's West European allies will find themselves defenceless. This was declared, in particular, by the defence ministers of the FRG and France.

The total untenability of this theory is backed up by the following argument: if the West European governments were really concerned over the threat of their countries' "security being lowered", it would be logical for them to join actively in the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons and ban the Star Wars programme, instead of taking part in one form or another in the implementation of the American SDI.

Scenario Three. The Euro-SDI pursues exclusively defense objectives. However, as in the case of the American SDI, the word "defensive" is used solely as a decoy. With the help of a European antimissile defence system the aggressive NATO circles, with the United States behind them, are hoping to screen military facilities, primarily the American nuclear first-strike weapons (Pershing-2 and cruise missiles) deployed in a number of West European countries, and tip the "Eurostrategic" and global balance in NATO's favour.

Multitier Threat

Persistent attempts are being made from across the Atlantic to "prompt" West Europeans to accept various schemes and draft constructs of the future antimissile defence system in limited and extended variants. [paragraph continues]

The American strategy planners claim, in particular, that the "first variant" of this system could be created as early as the mid-1990s on the basis of the modified American Patriot antiaircraft missiles which will have to be deployed by NATO. This system, they believe, consisting of approximately 1,000 Patriot missiles equipped with the latest sensors and including two aircraft radar stations, can protect a "large part of key NATO bases" in Western Europe. American experts maintain that to intercept cruise missiles, it could be possible to deploy American Hawk antiaircraft missiles, also equipped with the latest radioelectronic gadgets. The purpose of this "limited" system, as it is frankly stated, is not to protect the civilian population, but to ensure the "survival of a sufficient part of the Western capability to conduct nuclear and conventional war."

However, the advocates of the Euro-SDI would not like to limit themselves to these variants. They are also demanding a more ramified antimissile defence system in Western Europe, a system which would use "exotic" armaments. As reported by Der Spiegel magazine on December 2, 1985, research conducted by the West European branch of High Frontier, an organization of the SDI lobby in the USA, recommends that the following two possibilities be examined: 1) the possibility of developing a high-energy laser capable of piercing and destroying an aircraft fuselage and missile body; 2) the possibility of building an electro-magnetic gun with a firing rate of up to 60 rps. These ground-based weapons are to be trained with the help of target search and weapons control systems deployed on airborne facilities.

Another variant of a "ramified" ABM system for Western Europe, including space-based elements, was described by the newspaper Washington Times in September 1985. It wrote that, according to calculations carried out in the USA, a system of space combat platforms, deployed at relatively "low altitudes of c.300 km above the Earth" would be "relatively inexpensive" and ensure the "protection" of Western Europe.

Ideas of this kind are vigorously supported by the Heritage Foundation, an American right-wing organization. This organization suggests a three-tier system as a variant of the Star Wars system for Western Europea

- the first tier should include antimissiles and groundbased sensors intended to hit missiles on their active flight leg;

- the second tier would ensure "ultimate defence" thanks to a combination of antimissiles and conventional and nuclear devices which are launched against warheads when they enter the atmosphere on their way to the targets.

The third tier would insure "ultimate defence" thanks to a combinatin of antimissals and conventional and nuclear devices whicdh are launched against warheads when they enter the atmosphere on their way to the targets.

Edward Teller, the "father" of the American hydrogen bomb, has been particularly zealous in advocating the development of nuclear weapons for the Euro-SDI. At a symposium in Paris sponsored by the Heritage Foundation in June 1985, he said that France had the best chance of making a contribution to Star Wars, notably, in whatever concerns the destruction of ballistic missiles "at the stage of warhead entry into the atmosphere".

Those in Western Europe in protest against every kind of Star Wars do not at all embarrass the Washington hawks.

The advocates of the European Defence Initiative stake mainly on the interest shown by the West European military-industrial monopolies in profits which would come from taking part in this programme. Washington has thus been able to set up "fifth columns" inside a number of West European countries. These are arms manufacturers and ultra-conservatives who, in the chase for profits and through their hatred for the USSR and other socialist countries, are preapred to forsake the security interests of their own countries.

In an article in the Hamburg weekly Die Zeit of February 28, 1986, FRG Defence Minister Woerner admitted that "the Federal Republic and the USA had been working for several years on a system which in its tactical-technical performance creates a new quality in the direction of obtaining enhanced capabilities for antimissile defence." Speaking at a NATO conference in Kiel devoted to the implementation of the SDI, Ruehle, chief of the headquarters on planning matters at the FRG Ministry of Defence, announced that Bonn had earmarked several billion marks to develop a ground-air missile intended to destroy not only aircraft and cruise missiles, but even ballistic missiles. Its initial variant should be based on the American Patriot missile. According to Ruehle, the new project should enable the FRG to "leave the stage where it played the part of junior partner of the USA in the sphere of rocket manufacture." Woerner, and Weinberger singed a "declaration of intentions" about the establishment of a West German-American working group to study the possibilities of developing this missile.

In the FRG, the biggest military-industrial firms such as the Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm (MBB) Telefunken, Lorenz, Dornier, Siemens, Zeiss and others are involved in developing components for an antimissile defence system.

The British corporations British Airspace, Marconi Space and Defence Systems Ltd, Thorn EMI Electronics Ltd, and the "unofficial industrial club", formed by 30 British companies to study the best way of fulfilling commitments of the Star Wars programme, have offered their services as contractors and subcontractors for the SDI and the Euro-SDI.

In France such companies as Thomson-CSF, Aerospatiale and Matra are very active in this sphere. The first two of them have already been awarded a contract to develop the Aster missile systems of the ground-air class intended to hit aircraft and missiles. (France has suggested that the FRG and Britain should join in this programme.) Besides this, the Thomson-CSF firm and the West German MBB have received a 135 million dollar contract to modernize the Hawk missile system with a view to incorporating it in the latest achievements of electronics.

In Italy the Augusta corporation heads a consortium of eight large aerospace and electronics firms operating in the sphere of programming for high-speed computers, in electrical optics and lasers, and infrared devices.

In the USA work is underway to develop and antimissile system for Western Europe on the basis of the Hawk and Patriot missiles. In the fiscal 1985, 92.3 million dollars were allocated for these programmes. Under an agreement between the USA and the FRG, Bonn is to purchase 12 Patriot systems from the USA and receive an additional 12 systems gratis. Moreover, under the same agreement, the Bundeswehr should operate another 12 systems belonging to the USA. According to some reports, Patriot systems should be installed in the Netherlands, and then in Belgium. Of late the USA has drastically increased pressure on the NATO countries to speed up decision making and the implementation of the Euro-SDI.

The debates among the advocates of deploying antimissile defence in NATO West European countries boil down to he question of what type of system the Euro-SDI should be -- nuclear or conventional, ground- or space-based or of a mixed type, developed on the basis of American programmes and systems (SDI, Patriot, Hawk) or on the basis of European R and D.

Whatever one of all these variants is chosen, it is clear that the Euro-SDI will open a new, additional channel of the arms race, sharply destabilizing the situation on the European continent, and considerably lowering the security level of European countries. The idea of building the Euro-SDI is completely at variance with he Soviet-American understanding reached at the Geneva summit and can only compound the process of talks on nuclear and space weapons and cause additional difficulties on the way to solving the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe.

The implementation of the Euro-SDI programme in combination with the American Star Wars programme would only damage the vital interests of all countries -- big and small, both those belonging to military alliances and those that are neutral, in Eastern and Western Europe.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS SEES 'UNDISGUISED IRRITATION' IN FRG OVER SDI ACCESS

LD181723 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 18 Aug 86

[Text] Bonn August 18 TASS--TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov reports:

The decision of the U.S. Congress to restrict access of West European partners, including the FRG to research work within the Star Wars programme has given rise to undisguised irritation of the right-wing conservative government of CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] Free Demcratic Party. The Bonn cabinet qualified the decision as running counter to the FRG-USA governmental agreement on West German firms' participation in the implementation of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. As is reported by the newspaper GENERAL ANZEIGER, close to the FRG's Foreign Ministry, the federal authorities intend in this connection to make a representation to Washington.

Yet until recently the leading FRG politicians extolled the SDI in every way, advocated active participation in the project which allegedly promises the FRG a land of milk and honey, some "breakthrough in the technological front," and then such an embarrassment. The FRG Minister of Economics Martin Bangemann (Free Democratic Party) who put on his own his signature to the American-West German SDI accords, was compelled to say that the decision of the U.S. Congress was "poor policy." It is inadmissible, the minister lamented, first to impose cooperation, and then give it up.

In connection with the U.S. SDI decision the demands that the accord between the two countries be annulled are becoming ever louder in the FRG. The biggest opposition party, the Social Democratic Party of Germany, has demanded that this be done overnight. Karsten Voigt, a foreign policy expert of the parliamentary faction of the Social Democratic Party of German in a DDP [DEUTSCHER DEPESCHEN-DIENST] interview described the terms on which the SDI agreement was concluded as a "fatal delusion." Bonn's hopes for economic advantages have been dashed, the politician noted. Olaf Feldman, the disarmament expert of the faction of the Free Democratic Party in the Bundestag in an interview to the newspaper BILD AM SONNTAG stressed the need of "drawing proper conclusions" from the decision of the U.S. Congress. He mentioned, among them, a possibility of denouncing it in a three months' time, stipulated in the American-West German SDI accord.

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: MID-AUGUST COMMENTS ON JAPANESE SDI ROLE

'Inclination To Participate'

OW141257 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 12 Aug 86

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] According to a KYODO report, on 8 August a cabinet task force held another session on Japan's participation in the SDI, Strategic Defense Initiative. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev makes the following comment:

Ministers in the task force expressed the view that Japan's participation in the research phase of the SDI program did not violate a Diet resolution on peaceful use of outer space. After listening to this view, which was expressed in a roundabout way, KYODO seems to have reached the conclusion that through the meeting of the cabinet task force, the government has taken a step closer to Japanese participation in space militarization. An inclination to participate in the SDI has particularly increased since the Liberal Democratic Party scored a victory in the general election on 6 July. On 18 July, major ministers of the Nakasone cabinet virtually gave approval to Japan's participation in the U.S. "star wars" plan.

Nevertheless, no complete consensus has yet been reached on this question among the Japanese leadership. Chief Cabinet Secretary Gotada disclosed that a decision on Japan's participation in the SDI would promptly be made within this month. Frightened by this disclosure, Prime Minister Nakasone made a prudent remark that the question was still under study and that it was not known when the decision would be made. This difference of views is not of a fundamental nature; however, it reflects a recognitiaon of the danger caused to Japan by its possible participation in the SDI.

The United States has evidently placed Japan in a difficult position by asking this allied nation to support the realization of its "star wars" plan. This is because agreement to participate in the SDI, the Stragetic Defense Initiative, first means violating Japan's three nonnuclear principles and various peace-loving principles declared by the Diet and supported by the people. The "star wars" plan is a nuclear program which the United States regards as a means to achieve strategic supremacy over the Soviet Union. It is necessary only for the generals from the Pentagon, the U.S. Department of Defense. The danger the SDI poses to the efforts for peace and stability is already known to all people. This is why the Japanese Government has been trying avoid touching this unfavorable issue.

In order to find an excuse for its effort to meet the U.S. request, the Japanese Government cites the examples of West Germany and Britain. However, Japan is neither West Germany nor Britain. These two countries do not have peace constitutions or nonnuclear principles. They are affiliated with NATO and openly maintain U.S. nuclear arms on their teritories. In this context, Japan has been sacrificing many more things politically. It should follow the examples of France and Australia. These two countries are U.S. allies, but they have refused to participate in the SDI, taking their national interests into consideration. It seems to be necessary to repeatedly mention that a country cannot call itself a peaceful nation while supporting a move to expedite nuclear arming. In the context of this reality, an assertion from a technological standpoint that Japanese industry, by participating in the SDI, could benefit from the advanced technology seems to have no reasonable ground. The SDI will soon turn into a no-profit-bearing arms-production scheme by the U.S. military-industry complex. Japan's economy and science have thus far made progress without the SDI.

Nakasone on 1969 Resolution

LD150852 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT 15 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo August 15 TASS -- The Nakasone government edged closer towards its goal of participation in the American "star wars" programme after announcing that it did not contravene the parliament resolution dating back to 1969.

The government alleged that the resolution, which restricted the use of outer space only by peaceful purposes, dealt only with Japanese research and did not apply to cooperation with the USA.

In a bid to mislead the public, it echoed the American Administration which claimed that the Strategic Defense Initiative was purely defensive in nature.

Integrated Circuits

LD260912 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 26 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo August 26 TASS -- Japanese companies manufacturing components for computers are preparing to start large-scale production of integrated circuits from gallium arsenide, a material, which is much superior in its characteristics to the traditional silicon.

As the KYODO agency said, the United States shows much interest in the Japanese novel technology. It hopes to use integrated circuits of a new type to create superfast computers and intersatellite communication and control systems which are to be applied in the implementation of the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative".

/7358
CSO: 5200/1457

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: COMMENTS ON IMPENDING JAPANESE SDI ANNOUNCEMENT

Broadcast to Japan

OK041150 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 3 Sep 86

[Dmitriyev Commentary]

[Text] Listeners: As you know, the Japanese Government is about to announce its participation in the U.S. "Star Wars" plan in the near future. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev writes as follows:

)MIURI SHIMBUN has reported on the principles the Japanese government regards as grounds for Japan's participation in the moves to militarize outer space. When we review the events in Japan since the United States asked Japan to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] 1 year and a half ago, we find that the Japanese government has spent a great deal of time and energy studying the principles regarding Japan's participation.

Ms Alice T. Marlin, director of a U.S. private research institute, the Council on Economic Priorities, recently warned against the consequences Japan's participation in the SDI may entail. Based on a close analysis of the situation, Marlin drew the following two important conclusions. First, Japan's participation in the SDI will not produce any economic, scientific, or technological benefits for Japan. Second, perhaps more significant for Japan, Japan's participation in the SDI will weaken Japan's security rather than consolidating it.

It is clear that Japan's participation in the obviously anti-Soviet military plan will not have any benefits for Japan's security. What is more, the plan we are discussing here is related to the nuclear program. As is widely known, the plan to militarize outer space is aimed at placing x-ray lasers, a kind of nuclear weapon which uses a nuclear explosion as its motive force, in orbit. Here, it is not important what triggering device is used for a nuclear explosion. Noteworthy is the fact that research is now being conducted in the United States on reducing what is called the loss of effectiveness of laser beams as they pass through the atmosphere. These laser beams are designed for direct attacks against cities of so-called hypothetical enemies of the United States such as the Soviet Union. In addition, the SDI's (?nuclear targets) are directly connected with so-called conventional-type offensive weapons. Experts not affiliated with governmental organizations have long asserted with unanimity that the SDI does not guarantee a reliable defense for the entire territory of the United States, not to speak of the territories of its allies. Space-based antimissile defense is, in fact, designed to defend the launching sites of U.S. strategic nuclear missiles. It is aimed at protecting strategic nuclear missiles

against retaliatory attacks and securing an advantageous position for making a first strike. The idea of achieving such an advantageous position is an illusion. Therefore, the establishment of such a system may easily entice one to launch a first nuclear strike based on an unrealizable wish for victory.

This then would be the strategic result of the space militarization program, in which Japan is going to participate through the efforts of its government. If Japan should participate, it would be the first participant in the same rank as the countries belonging to this military bloc. This means, above anything else, that the U.S. Government -- whenever it wants to draw Japan into its military plans -- will use Japan's SDI participation as a pretext. It will also become a precedent in violating Japan's three nonnuclear principles, principles which were declared in a Diet resolution regarding the peaceful use of outer space, and other important Japanese policies. These breaches would be a direct result of Japan's SDI participation, in whatever manner it is effected.

In his speech on Soviet television on 28 August, General Secretary Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union would speedily find effective measures to neutralize the SDI. This would virtually mean the continuation of nuclear armament and, consequently, an increased military threat. To prevent such a development, we should act now to check space militarization before it gets started. Before making a multipurpose decision, it is still possible for the Japanese Government to consider whether it should assist the space militarization program and promote armament.

In conclusion, let us quote from the remarks made by Ms Alice Marlin, director of the Council on Economic Priorities. Concerning the danger of star wars, Marlin said: It would be a historical event comparable to that of 1945. If nuclear weapons had been banned at that time, there would be no stockpiles of nuclear weapons throughout the world now. We cannot but agree with her views. Before it is too late, we should resolutely give a negative answer to space militarization.

TASS Warns on 'Consequences'

LD051202 Moscow TASS in English 2211 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 4 TASS -- TASS political analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

It has been decided to draw Japan into the U.S. "star wars" programme. Next week this decision will be announced officially. For the time being it was stated in Tokyo that this step did not contradict the parliamentary resolution (still in force) limiting Japan to using outer space only for peaceful purposes. Addressing editors of the KYODO Tsushin agency, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone substantiated the government's decision in the following way. The SDI programme, he said, provided for developing defensive military hardware with the use of vast outer space for the purpose of liquidating nuclear arms and also gave a chance for achieving considerable scientific and technical progress. Arguments advanced to justify the above decision are neither convincing nor original, closely resembling the reasoning of the "star wars" pro ramme masterminds.

Today the newspaper MAINICHI noted that the Japanese Government's decision did not dispel doubts which had existed from the very outset on the question of Japan's participation in the SDI: what will be with the country's "non-nuclear policy" and with the well-known decision of parliament? Does the SDI include nuclear weapons? The paper notes that the SDI is based on energy-guided weapons. It is well known that at

present such energy is generated only by nuclear explosions. MAINICHI adds that the SDI can boost the nuclear arms race, since its implementation will provoke counter measures of the opposing side. The paper is right. Indeed, the SDI gives a boost to the nuclear arms race, since it leads to new nuclear explosions and to more sophisticated types of weapons. According to scientists from the Los Alamos laboratory, the development of only one type of "third generation" weapons will need between 100 and 200 nuclear explosions. It means that joining the SDI, Tokyo actually authorizes the continuation of nuclear explosions whose discontinuation is demanded by all mankind. The paper is right about countermeasures too. If the USA continues to work on implementing the SDI, the USSR will find a reply which will make the SDI programme senseless. What is the reason for Japan then to join the programme which leads to strategic chaos and drastically increases the danger of a nuclear disaster?

Naturally, the Soviet Union will take into account consequences of the decision taken by Tokyo. The TOKYO SHIMBUN correspondent in Washington, Sakuma, writes that Japan, in the system of Japanese-American cooperation in the sphere of defence, played in the past, too, a definite role in the U.S. strategy spearheaded against the USSR. The drawing of Japan into the SDI, irrespective of whether it wants this or not, turns it into a mainstay of the U.S. anti-Soviet strategy.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY ON U.S., W. EUROPE CONFLICT OVER SDI

HK010450 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 22 Aug 86 p 7

["Jottings" by Te An: "Hitting Where It Hurts the Most"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate recently passed a bill concerning orders for goods related to the Strategic Defense Initiative: When goods are ordered for the anti-missile space plan, the order should not be placed with foreign companies unless U.S. enterprises are incapable of taking the orders.

This action has aroused a wave of indignation among the United States' Western European allies. On 18 August the FRG secretary of state solemnly published a statement saying that the U.S. Government had promised that it would follow both in spirit and words the agreement signed on the 27th of last March, which held that the FRG was a "reliable partner" of the United States and stipulated that in inviting tenders and implementing orders for the supply of goods related to the Strategic Defense Initiative, Western Europe was "in the same position as" the United States. [paragraph continues]

However, now the United States has unilaterally decided that foreign companies should be discriminated against. Does it want to execute the agreement?

All at once, politicians of both the Christian Democratic Union and the Free Democratic Party criticized this decision by U.S. Senate. Luci Shitzfenhagen of the Christian Democratic Union said indignantly that West German companies ought to have an equal right to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative. If those who attempt to refuse Europe equal rights get an upper hand in Washington, it "will be a heavy burden of the FRG and on FRG-U.S. relations." A defense specialist of the Free Democratic Party indignantly suggested that they had to study the possibility of canceling the FRG-U.S. agreement on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

It seems that West German political circles have good reason to be indignant. Originally, the United States said something very nice when it invited its Western European allies to participate in the plan, stating that it would regard them as "equal partners" in cooperating with them and planned to share the achievements with Western Europe and so on. However, as soon as it dealt with the key issue of orders for goods, it refused its allies equal opportunities. Can this be regarded as a way to deal with "equal partnera". However, the Western European allies have long been prepared for this. They already know the disposition of its ally the United States will; therefore, they have started their own "Eureka" plan.

/12858
CSO: 5200/4072

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET SCIENTISTS COMMENT ON USSR'S 'ANTI-SDI SYSTEM'

PM271052 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 23 Aug 86 p 8

[Unattributed report: "USSR Scientists: "We Will Be Able To Perforate Space Shield'"]

[Text] Rome -- The Soviet Union is working hard on a kind of "anti-SDI" system designed to render the American space shield ineffective the very moment the U.S. Administration succeeds in sending into orbit the weapons and detectors needed to confine Moscow's nuclear missiles to the ground. This is the most important confirmation that emerged from the press conference that the five Soviet scientists attending the Erice meeting gave at the Soviet Embassy in Rome.

Having answered several questions about the meetings organized by Professor Zichichi, relations with American scientists, the chances of international cooperation, and the Chernobyl disaster, the Russian experts confirmed that they are working on the anti-SDI system.

The group of Soviet scientists was composed of Andrey Kokoshin, Aleksey Arbotov, Mikhail Gerasev, Garegin Aslanyan, and Stanislav Rodionov. The information about the anti-SDI working group was provided mainly by Gerasev, a young physicist on the staff of the USSR Academy of Sciences' United States of America and Canada Institute. "The day after Reagan's 23 March 1983 speech we set up a working group that began to examine the possibilities of countering America's star wars; our assessments enabled us to identify areas in which it will be possible to work to nullify SDI at a cost vastly smaller than that needed to put the space shield into orbit."

The Soviet scientist declined to add much more, though a small point of information did come from the head of the Soviet delegation, Andrey Kokoshin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, according to whom it will be relatively easy to electronically "blind" the sensors of the detection network designed to indicate the launching of Soviet missiles. Gerasev intimated that the USSR is specializing in the development of the famous killer satellites and antisatellite missiles capable of disrupting a future U.S. antimissile system. So electronic warfare would seem to be the area in which the Soviets hope to achieve the best results in their race against the space shield. In a publication released recently by APN a "Committee of Soviet scientists for peace" set out in detail the sectors on which Soviet research is concentrating its attention: High-power land-based lasers -- much simpler to construct than those that the Americans want to put into orbit to destroy USSR missiles as they are launched -- could be used as an active counter--countermeasure. According to Soviet scientists "the creation of these lasers could be much simpler than that of lasers installed on orbital stations." Ballistic missiles of a different kind could be targeted on the various "weak points" of an

antimissile system such as the United States wants to develop. The first "sensitive" target would be the centers protecting the super-computers designed to control SDI and above all the data-link systems between detectors and central computers and between the latter and the various space weapons capable of hitting Moscow's ballistic missiles. "Shrapnel" and space mines could be devices to be launched or kept in orbit alongside the American detectors.

The subject has hitherto been barely touched on: It will be interesting to see how far Russian scientists have in fact reached in their research. It is in any case interesting to note that, if nothing else, the Soviet scientists' remarks at their embassy yesterday hinted at a new element in the Soviet negotiating line. Many other issues were broached at yesterday's press conference, however, though there were few novelties worthy of note. Profressor Kokoshin and his colleagues were full of praise for the action taken by Zichichi, whose mediation is proving to be much more well received by the Soviet academic world than Italy has hitherto realized. The Soviet scientists said they were in favor of many of the joint experiments proposed at the Erice conference. The Soviet scientists also answered questions about the Chernobyl disaster: On this subject the only news was the mention of the discussions that arose in the USSR following the explosion about the opportuneness of persevering with nuclear power for the production of electrical energy. The opinion of the five scientists (who certainly express the thinking of the Soviet academic leadership) is that it is necessary to pursue this path, to examine safer power plants, but in any case to produce electricity from the atom. In answer to a question there was also a mention of dissident physicist Andrey Sakhorov: "He is still working with us in the field of theoretical physics and recently published a major study on aspects of cosmology," one of the Soviets said.

Another topic was the impossibility of a limited nuclear war: It is an exclusively military issue, a question of military doctrine, but the scientists' confirmation is significant because it clarifies the parameters within which work is being conducted by those who produce for the military the tools needed to maintain the deterrent. If the Red Army considers a nuclear confrontation limited to confined theaters out of the question, this is also the approach with which the scientists are working.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1562

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS ON AUSTRALIAN SDI REPORT--Canberra, 29 Aug (TASS)--TASS correspondent Aleksey Voronin reports: Australia should not participate in work on "Star Wars" plans either at the governmental level or through the participation of private companies in SDI-related "research." This conclusion was drawn in a report of the Disarmament Subcommission of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense. The report has not yet been released and, according to the press, will be submitted for discussion in September. Its authors are convinced, however, that further SDI work can lead to a serious escalation of the arms race. Even if it is technologically reasible to develop a "missile shield," about which President Reagan is dreaming, the report notes, the existing balance of the strategic forces would be badly upset. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 29 Aug 86 LD] /9274

TASS ON REAGAN SHUTTLE ANNOUNCEMENT--Washington, 16 Aug, TASS--President Ronald Reagan officially announced on Friday the decision on building a replacement for the reusable space shuttle "Challenger", which was destroyed in a disaster six months ago. The new spaceship is to be completed by 1992. Simultaneously the President announced that from now on NASA would not attend to commercial launchings of satellites on contracts with private companies. As follows from the President's statement, U.S. reusable spaceships will in the first place be used for launchings necessary "in the national security interests." [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 16 Aug 86 LD] /7358

CSO: 5200/1457

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY URGES U.S., USSR TO REDUCE ARMAMENTS

HK300600 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 24 Aug 86 p 6

["Jottings" by Wen Yun: "Measures Had Better Be Drastic"]

[Text] More than 20 years ago, the United States and the Soviet Union set up their White House-Kremlin hot line, but few outsiders really know the actual function of this hot line. Now, the two governments are considering setting up a "center for reducing the risks of a nuclear war" in their respective capitals.

The main purpose of setting up this hot line is to promptly remove all risk when it emerges; it is said that the two sides can use their "risk centers" to "conduct regular discussions and exchange technological information" and meanwhile they will enable the two sides to carry out frequent dialogue on nuclear policies so as to prevent a nuclear confrontation between them.

However, while they are busy rigging such "centers" for reducing the risks of a nuclear war, the two countries are also secretly planning a nuclear war with the other side as the imaginary enemy and are making solid preparations for such a war. It is reported that the U.S. military authorities are secretly designing and building a combat system which can fight a "protracted nuclear war" and are planning to spend some $40 billion to develop nuclear weapons, and this has been approved by the U.S. Congress. It is reported that the Soviet Union is also planning to use advanced weapon systems to replace its existing strategic nuclear strike force, intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched missiles, and bombers by the mid 1990's.

A Chinese saying goes: Stirring boiling water can never stop the water from boiling, only pulling the firewood out from under the kettle can make water stop boiling. Now the two big nuclear powers -- the United States and the Soviet Union -- should take actual steps to reduce their armaments rather than talking about such things as the "centers for reducing the risks of a nuclear war" and indulging in flowerly and empty verbiage. Otherwise, no matter how many hot lines and "centers" they set up, the world's people will never feel safe.

/12858
CSO: 5200/4071

SALT/START ISSUES

IZVESTIYA HITS U.S. SALT ACCORDS ATTITUDE

PM040938 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Matveyev article: "A Step on the Slippery Path. Washington's Course Aimed at Violating Its Strategic Arms Limitation Obligations"]

[Text] Using General L. Welch, chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force, as a mouthpiece, official Washington recently gave notification that the United States is setting about canceling its obligations stemming from the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms — SALT II — signed by the USSR and the United States in 1979 and to all intents and purposes in effect since that time.

This is the thrust of a statement made by L. Welch at a meeting with journalists in the Pentagon on 18 August. He communicated facts which show that the United States is taking the first (and, of course, not the last) step in violation of its treaty obligations.

What we are talking about here is the fact that the U.S. Air Force has begun work to reequip the 131st B-52 bomber to fit it with cruise missiles capable of carrying nuclear charges and striking such targets as intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) silos and others. The United States has already carried out such work on 130 B-52 bombers. The adaptation of the 131st bomber for such missiles will mean that the United States will exceed the ceiling set by SALT II with regard to delivery vehicles for combat charges with multiple warheads. In the long term, according to statements made by high-ranking American figures in recent months, the administration intends to act as it thinks fit. It will not be guided by its SALT II obligations.

President Reagan announced his intention to cease observance of the treaty on 27 May. The Pentagon was given the green light to take things as far as breaking the agreed limitations on the deployment of strategic weapons.

The Soviet side has pointed out the serious consequences of such steps for the international situation, bilateral relations, and the Geneva talks. The brakes holding back the buildup of the most destabilizing, dangerous weapons are being cast aside. It is not difficult to see the possible consequences for this for the situation in the world and for Soviet-American relations, which are already lacking in thrust. And without trust is it really possible to achieve positive results at the negotiating table with the complex agenda we have?

To listen to American officials it would appear as if the SALT II obligations apply solely to the United States rather than both sides. They want to persuade the public

that the United States will supposedly gain something as a result of rejecting the aforementioned treaty. The real facts have nothing in common with these conjectures. TIME magazine, which is well informed in these matters, wrote in its 9 June issue: "The Soviet Union has dismantled hundred of nuclear delivery vehicles in accordance with the limits stipulated by the treaty."

This is indeed so. During the period that the strategic arms limitation accords have been in effect the USSR has withdrawn 540 strategic weapons delivery vehicles from its arsenal in accordance with its obligations, whereas the United States, fulfilling its obligations, has withdrawn 168. The figures speak for themselves.

The aforementioned treaty contains provisions taking into account the urgent wishes of the American side -- just as our security interests are taken into account. The U.S. Government cannot consider itself free of the agreed obligations without realizing that the Soviet Union will take very measure necessary to ensure its own defense capability.

The result will be the spiraling of the arms race, which poses a threat to the whole of mankind. This is why even Washington's closest Western European allies reacted negatively to the White House 27 May statement. "We believe that SALT II creates a basis for good accords, and we will be extremely sorry if the United States deems it necessary to renounce the treaty," British Foreign Secretary G. Howe said. Joseph Clark, Canadian foreign minister, described Washington's decision as "a highly worrying event."

At a recent NATO Council session in Halifax (Canada), not one of the United States' partners supported Secretary of State Shultz when he tried to elicit support in connection with the aforementioned decision.

In the United States itself the Senate and the House of Representatives took a majority vote in favor of approving a resolution calling on the government to observe the treaty. Competent American figures reject references made by the White House and the Pentagon to the Soviet Union's alleged "violations" of the treaty. "Voicing dissatisfaction over Soviet violations," the newspaper THE BOSTON GLOBE wrote, "Is one of the methods of averting criticism of the Pentagon budget."

Criticism is growing on an increasing scale in the United States, including within Congress itself. Of no help are the consistently unbalanced appeals by the White House to members of the Senate and House of Representatives to reconcile themselves to the renunciation of the treaty. The "ammunition" used in these appeals is like Trishka's caftan [reference to Krylov fable written in 1815]; the more it is patched up, the more the more visible the tears become.

General Welch made his own contribution to this propaganda "patching up." He virtually confirmed that the U.S. government is setting about overturning everything which was worked out in the course of long, sustained negotiations between our two countries and which opened the way to large-scale measures to reduce the strategic arsenals of the two countries.

He said in less veiled form what is being thought by circles in the United States, which are up in arms against the very idea of disarmement and are consequently intriguing against the talks being conducted between the USSR and the United States. General Welch did not speak directly on the subject, but what he did say has a direct bearing on it -- and cannot fail to put one seriously on one's guard. It was no minor official speaking about a man who holds a responsible position. But there was no trace

of a responsible attitude to elementary facts. What he said hangs like an empty shell on a single "thread": The USSR "must" supposedly reduce its military arsenal while the United States is to build up its own...

How is it possible to go as far as to say this? It is very simple. By painting a picture that has nothing in common with the true situation. Thus, he claimed that the USSR has twice as many nuclear warheads as the United States, that U.S. territory is "more vulnerable," and so on and so forth. The general needed to say all this to be able to refuse to have anything to do with even a very small step forward in talks with our country that would lead to reciprocal accords on arms reduction.

But what should the talks be about in this case? This question is being asked by influential Americans soberly weighing up the consequences of their government's rejection of the aforementioned treaty. Democrat Lee Hamilton, member of the House of Representatives, wrote in a recent article: "The rejection of SALT II will have a serious political consequences. The Geneva talks and Soviet-American relations will suffer as a result.... The structure of strategic arms control which has been supported by four presidents for more than 15 years will be destroyed.... We (the United States) will have less security."

What former CIA director W. Colby and political analyst R. English, who worked in the Pentagon, wrote recently in the newspaper THE LOS ANGELES TIMES is noteworthy. THey noted that "President Reagan has been given the opportunity to conclude an agreement on the most comprehensive arms limitations in the whole of mankind's history" as "the Russians have put forward several very positive proposals." But there are people among the White House advisers, and particularly in the Pentagon, the authors went on to point out, knowing what they are talking about, whose recommendations are calculated to ensure that no agreements are concluded at all.

The authors of the article did not elucidate the reason for this sharply aggressive stance. But the reason is that these circles are possessed by the desire to secure military superiority at all costs and use it in their far-reaching militarist ambitions. After the SALT II Treaty has been broken they would like to set about wrecking the unlimited-duration ABM treaty -- this barrier in the way of militarizing space.

Our country entered into talks with the United States, on the same basis as before, to reach agreements based on the principles of equality and identical security and not for the purpose of these talks serving as a screen while the other side forces the pace of an even more feverish arms race.

Strategic parity and a balance of forces exist between our country and the United States. Let us cite just the report by the U.S. defense secretary published in 1982. It states in black and white: "The United States and the Soviet Union are approximately equal in their strategic might." In terms of the number of nuclear warheads, as authoritative American specialists attest, the United States is even somewhat ahead of our country.

Claims regarding the United States' "vulnerability" in comparison to the Soviet Union also fail to stand up to criticism.

In the nuclear missile age, with the continuing arms race, all countries are up against an equally unprecedented threat and must do the maximum to remove this threat.

This is precisely the path taken by our country in cooperation and unity with our allies in the defensive Warsaw Pact. The Soviet Union is once again extending its unilateral nuclear test moratorium and urges the U.S. Administration to heed the voice of reason and follow this example. The same thing is being demanded by the entire world community, aware of the stakes involved. Mankind is capable of guaranteeing itself against nuclear catastrophe.

This is the command of life itself. And it cannot be avoided without fatal consequences for our entire planet.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1568

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF AKHROMEYEV ON U.S. SALT II POLICY

LD041243 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Sep (TASS) — In an interview with a TASS correspondent, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, has characterized the military-political consequences of the U.S. refusal to carry out the stipulations of the SALT II treaty in the following terms:

The consequences will be negative. The United States' refusal to implement the SALT II treaty does not help to reduce international tension or cut back strategic armaments. As a result of the United States' repudiation of the SALT II treaty, the sides would get freedom of action, effectively, in the deployment of their strategic nuclear forces.

In rejecting SALT II, President Reagan called on the Soviet Union to show restraint in the development of ICBM's and submarine-launched ballistic missiles. But what is such an appeal worth when the deployment of various forms of cruise missiles is not covered by this proposal? After all, the United States has already begun a massive deployment of these missiles and is planning to deploy several thousand of them. This proposal is completely unfair. Its aim is to secure unilateral advantages for the United States over the Soviet Union in the sphere of strategic weapons.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1568

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON U.S. ICBM TESTS

MX Test

PM281756 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Aug 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Provocation After Provocation. New MX Missile Test"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Aug -- Another MX ICBM test has been carried out in the United States. AP, citing a Pentagon spokesman, reported that the missile, equipped with nine independently targeted dummy warheads, was launched at Vandenberg Air Force Base (California) in the direction of Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific. According to a statement by spokesmen for the U.S. Defense Department, for the first time warheads were targeted on two different areas 112 kilometers apart.

With the present MX launch, the 13th, the Pentagon began the final stage of tests of the missile. It is reported that at this stage it is planned to carry out tests with flight servicing systems "on full alert." At the same time, MX deployment has commenced at Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming. By this December, according to U.S. press data, 10 missiles of this type will have been placed in a state of full combat readiness. For fiscal 1987 the White House has asked Congress for funds for the construction of another 21 missiles. The U.S. Administration intends to deploy a total of 100 of these strategic weapons. It is interesting that the MX test took place the day after an ASAT antisatellite system test. This is further evidence that as well as creating [sozdaniye] space weapons Washington intends to go ahead at full speed with the buildup of its strategic armaments.

Trident-1 Test

LD011953 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 1 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 1 TASS -- The United States tested another intercontinental ballistic missile C-4, known as the Trident-1. The missile was launched by a Poseidon submarine off the Florida coast. It was the 51st test launch of the missiles of this class, each of which can carry up to 8 independently targetable nuclear warheads. According to the AP, Navy officials said that the C-4 would become an important complement to the Navy's nuclear arms arsenal.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1568

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS ANNOUNCEMENTS ON SOVIET MISSILE TESTS IN PACIFIC

27 August

LD271213 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 27 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 27 TASS — In connection with the completion of the planned launches of booster rockets TASS is authorized to state that the areas in the Pacific limited each by a circle with a radius of 20 nautical miles, their centers located in latitude 47 degrees 00 minutes north and longitude 171 degrees 24 minutes east and in latitude 39 degrees 05 minutes north and 173 degrees 27 minutes east, which were the subject of the announcement of August 23, 1986, open to shipping and aircraft traffic from August 28, 1986.

1 September

LD011808 TASS International Service in Russian 1737 GMT 1 Sep 86

["TASS Announcement"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Sep (TASS) -- From 4 to 13 September 1986 carrier rockets [rakety nositeli] will be launched in the Soviet Union to the following areas:

An area of the Pacific Ocean with a radius of 70 sea miles based on a center with the coordinates of 26 degrees 32 minutes north and 173 degrees 18 minutes east. An area of the Pacific Ocean with a radius of 30 sea miles based on a center with the coordinates of 19 degrees 20 minutes north and 174 degrees 25 minutes east. TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the USSR Government asks the governments of other states that use sea and air routes in the Pacific to give instructions to the appropriate bodies, so that ships and aircraft do not enter these areas or the airspace above them from 1200 to 1700, local time, each day.

4 September

LD041123 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Sep (TASS) — In connection with the ending of planned launches of booster rockets, TASS is authorized to state that the following areas of the Pacific Ocean, as announced 1 September 1986, will be open to shipping and aircraft as of 5 September 1986:

An area with a radius of 70 nautical miles based on a center with the coordinates of 26 degrees 32 minutes north, and 173 degrees 18 minutes east, and an area with a radius of 30 nautical miles based on a center with the coordinates of 19 degrees 20 minutes north, and 174 degrees 25 minutes east.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1568

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF AKHROMEYEV ATTENDS CDE

Arrival in Stockholm

LD281052 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 28 Aug 86

[Text] Stockholm, 28 Aug (TASS)--Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR and chief-of-staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, arrived here today to address the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

He was met at the airport by the Soviet Union's ambassador to Sweden, Boris Pankin, ambassador-at-large Oleg Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation to the Stockholm conference, and officials of the Swedish Government and Defence Ministry.

Meets Swedish Officials

LD281424 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 28 Aug 86

[Excerpts] Stockholm, 28 Aug (TASS)--Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR and a first deputy defense minister of the USSR who is visiting here, has met with Pierre Schori, secretary-general of the Swedish Foreign Ministry. During the conversation they discussed the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence/ and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, and the key problems of international security.

Sergey Akhromeyev paid visits to Swedish Defense Minister Roine Carlsson and General Lennard Ljung, commander-in-chief of the Swedish Armed Forces.

Sergey Akhromeyev was accompanied during his meetings and visits by Boris Pankin, Soviet ambassador to Sweden.

Addresses Plenary Session

PM011311 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Aug 86 Second Edition p 5

["At the Stockholm Conference"--TASS item]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy minister of defense, today addressed, on behalf of the Soviet Government, the plenary session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmamenet in Europe. The contemporary international situation, he said, is developing under the influence of the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. These are a program for the liquidation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction this century and proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, and a number of other initiatives.

The extension of the unilateral moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons to 1 January 1987 recently announced in a statement by Ceneral Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev is yet another important step by the Sovet Union toward breaking the closed circle of the arms race and making a start on the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons. I would like to hope that in the final analysis commonsense will prevail in Washington, and that the historic chance on the road to stopping the arms race will not be missed.

The role of the Stockholm conference in creating a system of reliable security is also great. The Soviet Union came to this international forum with the firm intention of leading the matter toward a search for mutual understanding, and toward the attainment of a mutually acceptable balance of interests. We are deeply convinced that an improvement in the situation on the European Continent and peace and calm in our European home would be of enormous significance not only for our continent but also for all other continents.

Much has already been done by the socialist countries, in cooperation with the other participants in the conference, for the attainment of agreement on such key questions as the nonuse of force, notification of military exercises and troops movements, the invitation of observers, and the implementation of monitoring [kontrol] the fulfillment of accords that have been attained. As a result the overall situation at the conference has changed for the better.

Some days ago an accord was attained on the notification of troop transfers to Europe, which could become an important link in a system of agreements intended to ensure European security.

The Soviet Union is proving with deeds its striving to reach agreement at the Stockholm conference. We are entitled to expect steps in return from the NATO states. However on a number of important questions being discussed at the conference, there is so far clearly insufficient movement in response [vstrechnoye dvizheniya] on their part. This concerns, for instance, such a problem as the limitation of the scale of military exercises. Taking into account that frequently the exercises being held by NATO countries are of an especially dangerous, destabilizing nature, the demand of the majority of European states for a substantial limitation of large exercises is perfectly legitimate. Then it would become more tranquil in Europe.

In order to reach an accord on the notification of whatever kind of military activity it is necessary to determine precisely which specific military activity will be subject

to notification and, correspondingly, verification.

The concept of notification of "outside-garrison activity" of troops, which is being proposed by NATO, does not provide a solution of this problem. It contains many loopholes of abuses and interference in the internal affairs of states. It must be a question of specific kinds of military activity -- of troop exercises, movements and transfers of troops, which are subject to notification. Much attention is being paid at the conference to the questions of monitoring and verification of the implementation of confidence-building measures. The Soviet Union is no less interested than other states in rigorous monitoring. The Soviet Government, motivated by a wish to see progress in the examination of the questions facing the conference, and to ensure that it ends with specific results, has deemed it possible to agree to inspections as a means of monitoring confidence-building measures. We, of course, believe that the inspections should not be to the detriment of anyone's security. Specifically, the USSR considers that each state taking part in the Stockholm conference ought to allow a quota of one or two inspections a year at places on its territory that lie within the European Continent. This would be done at the request of other participant states when there is suspicion about the observance of confidence-building measures on which agreement will be reached.

In the current complex international situation the positive conclusion of the Stockholm conference is very important. The main significance of this fact will lie in the fact that an important change for the better in European affairs and international affairs in general will have been made.

A press conference was also held at the Soviet Embassy today. It was addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev. He answered numerous questions from journalists.

Departs for Moscow

LD291640 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 29 Aug 86

[Text] Stockholm August 29 TASS -- Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief-of-staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense of the USSR, who today addressed the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, left for home.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1563

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS INTERVIEWS CHIEF OF STAFF AKHROMEYEV ON CDE ISSUES

Discusses Aerial Monitoring

LD041238 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1123 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Sep (TASS) -- In an interview with a TASS correspondent, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergy Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, touched upon the Soviet proposal at the Stockholm Conference for on-site inspections.

We are proposing, he said, that the regions being inspected where troop exercises are going on, on whose grounds suspicion has arisen on the other side, be inspected on the ground and from the air. What is more, the inspection would be carried out by groups from the other side in aircraft of the side that is being inspected. We do not see any contradiction here. Soviet pilots will fly Soviet planes, but over the territory of the Soviet Union. FRG plans will fly over the territory of the FRG, flown by the FRG pilots. The inspection is not being carried out by the pilots, but by the inspection groups. They will tell the pilots which direction to fly in, where to turn and give the opportunity to inspect a region. What is wrong with this? Countries in the NATO bloc are proposing a different option, whereby a foreign plane flies over the territory of another sovereign state. This plane may be equipped with the appropriate intelligence gear that can check not only the actions of troops in this region, but also be capable of reconnoitering any installation that is not the object of monitoring. This would be unlawful intelligence activity and a violation of a state's sovereignty. In my view our position is fair.

Views NATO Propcsal

LD041249 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Sep [TASS) -- Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, commented in an interview for a TASS correspondent on the proposal put forward by the NATO states at the Stockholm Conference, that a ban be put on the staging of exercises numbering more than 75,000 men if notification of them has been given less than 2 years previously [as received].

We evaluation of this proposal positively, Marshal Akhromeyev said. This helps to move the conference forward to some extent. But this is still not the main point. The main point is that exercises should not be conducted in Europe on the same massive scale NATO uses. At the moment the "Autumn Forge" exercises are in progress. In these, NATO's armed forces are put into motion on the whole of the territory of Western Europe

-- from the North Cape to the southern shores of Turkey. A major transfer of land troops and air forces from the territory of the United States to Europe is being carried out. The military staffs of the NATO states in Western Europe leave their regular stationing areas for field areas. There are more than 300,000 men, 2,000 aircraft, 4,000 tanks, and 300 ships taking part in the exercises. The NATO troops approach the borders of the Warsaw Pact states. How are we to react to this? Such exercises are difficult to distinguish from real preparations for war. We advocate that such big exercises not be staged. We prepare our armed forces to rebuff aggression. But we do not stage exercises on such a scale and we call on the other side not to stage them either. But so far this is being rejected.

Says Agreement Possible

LD041259 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1222 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Sep (TASS) -- Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, in connection with the possibility of achieving agreement in Stockholm, stated the following:

If the current stage of the Stockholm Conference proceeds successfully and the sides agree on specific measures of trust, on the notification of these measures and on effective monitoring, then the basis will be created for movement forward. It is not accidental that the conference is called the Conference on Measures to Strengthen Confidence, Security and Disarmament. If they agree at the conference on measures to build confidence, then it is quite logical to raise the next measures at the following stage -- disarmament measures. And measures to reduce armed forces in Europe are the goal the Soviet Union and other countries of the Warsaw Pact place before themselves. Proposals on this question were put forward in Budapest at the conference of the Warsaw Pact's Political Consultative Committee.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1563

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON END OF 1986 CD SESSION

Israelyan Speech

LD281511 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 28 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva August 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

This year's session of the Conference on Disarmament is drawing to a close. In the final speeches, its participants are analysing the results of the work done. Many note with regret that the conference has failed to make progress on a number of most important questions of arms race limitation and of disarmament.

The present, extremely important stage of history requires new approaches to the security problems by every state and joint efforts of the entire world community, head of the USSR delegation Viktor Israelyan said at today's plenary meeting. He said the Soviet Union advanced in 1986 a whole series of proposals helping to find solutions of those questions.

Central to them is the comprehensive plan of eliminating all kinds of weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century, advanced in the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, of January 15 of this year. The unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has been operating for over a year. It has been extended again, despite the lack of reciprocity from the U.S. side. The USSR made a number of important steps also in the sphere of monitoring the ending of tests with the use of international forms of verification, including on-site inspections.

Conducting consistently the line at [as received] a radical solution of the question of preventing an arms race in space, without which the removal of nuclear danger is unthinkable, the USSR proposed to work out a multilateral agreement on ensuring the immunity of artificial earth's satellites and banning anti-satellite systems. These proposals have been borne up by weighty actions: The Soviet unilateral moratorium on anti-satellite systems has been operating for three years.

New initiatives have been made also on banning chemical weapons. The initiatives have sped up the achievement of mutual understanding on key problems of the banning of chemical weapons, elimination of their stockpiles and industrial facilities for their production.

The Soviet initiatives are composite parts of the idea of an all-embracing system of international security formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress. They are evidence of the

manifestation of flexibility, readiness for compromise, the striving to find the way toward overcoming impasses.

The Soviet representative urged the United States, other NATO countries to join in the common effort for undelayed solution of problems facing humanity.

Results Assessed

LD291824 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 29 Aug 86

. ["Results of the Disarmament Conference" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Geneva August 29 TASS -- The session of the Disarmament Conference of 1986 has closed today. The current session differed from the preceding ones by the activeness of most of the delegations, the correspondence of their stands with the realities of the nuclear and space age. This has been in a considerable measure a result of the USSR's large-scale initiatives, central to which is the programme for the total elimination of all types of mass destruction weapons by the end of the 20th century.

Many delegations showed greater interest in the key problem of the present -- the limitation of the weapons race, nuclear disarmament, and displayed greater preparedness to outline specific measures in that field. The delegations of the United States and of the other Western powers, which blocked the start of the talks at the special agency under far-fetched pretexts, have found themselves in isolation.

The main issue of the agenda on the session was that of a ban on nuclear tests. Most of the participants in the conference have been unanimous that it is necessary to put an end immediately to nuclear tests and start drawing up an appropriate treaty.

The Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear blasts till the end of this year has met with broad approval of the participants in the conference. Many delegates urged the United States to join with the Soviet Union in that move. It was noted also that if the U.S. delegation removed the artificial barriers in the way of a start of effective work on the draft treaty, the Geneva conference would be able to play a decisive role in resolving that problem.

Many delegates have been also disappointed by the fact that through the fault of the Western group, above all of the USA, talks have not been started this year at the special committee on the conference on preventing the arms race in outer space. Yet, within the framework of the committee, a number of delegations tabled their definition of the term "space strike weapons" and expressed their attitude to many international legal aspects of the future agreement on preventing arms race in outer space.

A source of some gratification are the results of the talks on a ban on chemical weapons. The socialist states, which cannot think of a safe world without eliminating those brutal mass destruction weapons, put forward at the session a package of initiatives which made it possible to reach a number of fundamental accords on the way towards drafting an appropriate convention.

Yet, the decisions of the USA and NATO in favour of binary chemical rearmament are a source of concern, since they will program for years ahead not only the preservation, but also a strengthening of the chemical threat to mankind.

.e Western delegations would be well advised to substantiate their declarations on commitment to the cause of disarmament by specific steps at all talks, including at the disarmament conference, so that the forum should live up to the hopes placed on it by international public.

Israelyan Interviewed

PM291459 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, by IZVESTIYA own correspondent V. Kuznetsov, under the rubric "On a Topical Theme": "A Businesslike and Concrete Approach"]

[Text] The Disarmament Conference session ended its work in Geneva's Palais des Nations today. "What are the main results?" That question was asked by IZVESTIYA's own correspondent V. Kuznetsov to V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation.

Summing up the results of the work done by the conference this year, he said, it may be said objectively and without bias that the session was influenced by the Soviet Union's large-scale initiatives. The pivotal, central initiative in the program for the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of the 20th century, contained in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions has been in force for more than a year now, and has been repeatedly extended, despite the fact that the United States has carried out 18 nuclear tests during that period. The Soviet Union has taken weighty steps in the sphere of monitoring the ending of tests, using international forms of verification up and including on-site inspections.

Major measures were also proposed on the question of preventing an arms race in space, without which the nuclear threat cannot be eliminated. The elaboration of a multilateral agreement on ensuring the immunity of artificial earth satellites and banning antisatellite systems -- these are elements of our "star peace" program. The Soviet initiatives, V.L. Israelyan went on to say, determined the main positive result of the conference's work this year. A new approach appropriate to the realities of the nuclear and space era is becoming increasingly apparent in the positions of the vast majority of the delegations. The key question at the session was the banning of nuclear tests. The position of the conference, with the exception of the U.S. delegation and its closest allies, is clear on this -- nuclear tests should be stopped immediately and talks should begin with a view to concluding a corresponding agreement.

Finally, about the results of the talks on banning chemical weapons. The agreements in principle achieved regarding the quickest elimination of industrial bases for the manufacture of chemical weapons will bring forward an agreement on eliminating these weapons. If a similar readiness to compromise had been displayed by the Western side, the results would have been more substantial. The results of this year's session of the conference differ in many positive respects from those of previous years. However, it would be quite wrong to draw far-reaching conclusions from this. The lack of talks on the whole nuclear disarmament complex was extremely damaging to the conference. Nothing can justify the Western states' obstructionist position on this question. The United States and the other NATO countries, V.L. Israelyan said in conclusion, should back up the statement of their desire for disarmament with compromise proposals at all the current talks, including the Disarmament Conference.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1563

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET DEFENSE AIDE ON U.S. AIMS IN CONTINUED TESTING

PM291210 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Commentary by Army General V. M. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister: "Why Do They Need Tests?"--first three paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] In an attempt to justify the U.S. Administration's reluctance to join the moratorium on nuclear explosions, high-ranking administration representatives and, with its blessing, many people in the U.S. mass media are claiming that the continuation of nuclear tests is "necessary to check the reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenals."

At the same time Dr Jeremy Leggett of the Verification Technology Information Center (London) published a letter to the THE GUARDIAN in which he rejected the U.S. Administration's "argument" that nuclear bombs in arsenals have to be tested in order to be sure that they are in "working condition." Citing specialists' opinion, he writes that "this is only needed for the creation [sozdaniye] of more complex and more destabilizing new weapon designs."

The PRAVDA editorial office asked Army General V.M. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister, to comment on these statements.

Yes, I am aware of the statements by U.S. officials on the need for the United States to continue nuclear weapons tests in order to maintain confidence in the serviceability of their existing nuclear arsenal, he replied. However, this conclusion does not stand up to any criticism. It is aimed at people -- and there are many of them -- who are uninformed about the military-technical aspects of the question.

In fact, the checking of existing munitions is by no means the main aim of the nuclear tests. Military specialists are well aware that tests mostly serve to improve [otrabotka] and test new types of nuclear weapons.

Many corresponding examples can be cited from U.S. military programs. For instance, flight tests of MX intercontinental missiles are currently under way. This is a first-strike missile and powerful warheads with high-accuracy guidance systems are being developed [razrabatyvayutsya] for it.

Several versions of nuclear warheads are being created [sozdayetsya] for the new small Midgetman missile.

The new generation of Trident II sea-launched (from submarines) intercontinental missiles will also be equipped with highly accurate nuclear warheads.

New nuclear combat units are being created in the United States for the next generation of strategic cruise missiles.

More effective nuclear munitions, including neutron munitions, are also being developed [razrabatyvayutsya] for operational-tactical missiles and artillery.

Continuing to talk about the real aims of nuclear tests in the United States, I particularly want to dwell on space-based nuclear weapons, which are being developed [razrabatyvayetsya] under the SDI program. It is primarily a question of nuclear-pumped lasers, to put it more simply, nuclear explosive devices.

The Americans attach great importance to this type of weapon, considering it to be a promising strike weapons for space battles.

It is well-known from various sources that the United States is, moreover, working on transforming the energy generated by nuclear explosions into other types of directed energy for striking various targets in and from space.

I think that what I have said is enough to make it clear why the United States is not going along with the Soviet Union's proposal for a complete end to nuclear tests. It is not a question of "checking reliability" but of creating [sozdaniye] new types of nuclear weapons. In that sense Dr Leggett is not far from the truth.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that we military men, who are responsible for our state's defense capability, are closely watching the U.S. Administration's actions in the field of the development of U.S. military-technical potential. We are sure that if necessary Soviet science and industry will be able to give a worthy rebuff to the Americans' attempt to wreck the existing military-strategic equilibrium to their own advantage.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES U.S. PEACE GROUP ON SECRET NUCLEAR TEST

Test Codenamed 'Galveston'

LD061928 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1823 GMT 6 Sep 86

[Report by TASS correspondent Maksim Knyazkov]

[Excerpt] New York, 6 Sep (TASS) — Ignoring the will of the peace-loving public, the Reagan administration has carried out another nuclear weapons test. This was announced by the U.S. antiwar organization "American Peace Test."

According to its evidence, the explosion, under the codename "Galveston" was carried out on this test site [as received] at 0909 local time on 4 September. Precisely at that moment local seismic stations registered a subterranean shock with a force of 3.5 percents of the Richter scale.

According to data in the possession of the organization, the explosion was carried out in a vertical shaft at section 19 of the test site, at the order of a research center in Los Alamos (New Mexico). This center is well known in the United States as one of the main suppliers for the Pentagon. Active work is carried out in its laboratories to perfect nuclear weapons and also to develop nuclear and nonnuclear space systems within the "star wars" program. To all intents, this is why the test was of a strictly secret nature and there was no official announcement about it.

The explosion is the 19th nuclear test in the United States since the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear weapons tests on 6 August 1985. It is significant that it was carried out the very day the second round of Soviet-U.S. talks on ending nuclear weapons tests started in Geneva. [passage omitted]

Bogachev Commentary

LD070810 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS — By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev:

Demonstrating disregard for the vital interests of the people living on this planet, the U.S. Administration has exploded yet another nuclear device at the testing range in Nevada, the U.S. anti-war organization American peace test reported.

Washington has gone ahead with the latest test at a time when the Soviet Union has refrained from any nuclear explosions for 13 months and when Moscow's decision to

continue observing its unilateral test moratorium till January 1, 1987, has kindled hope for a long-awaited turn for the better in international relations.

As if mocking the Americans' common sense, the U.S. Administration claims that the only reliable route to disarmament is through a U.S. nuclear arms buildup.

If the propaganda-makers from Washington are to be believed, for the nuclear weapons to grow "obsolete", they should first be modernized and for them to become "impotent", the yields of the nuclear warheads on American missiles should be increased.

To follow the twisted logic of the politicoes from the Pentagon, the U.S. nuclear blasts are bringing nearer the day when it will be possible to end the testing of weapons of mass annihilation.

A ban on nuclear testing would be a very simple yet effective measure to bridle the arms race.

An agreement to stop testing can hurt the security interests of neither side.

The Soviet Union's large-scale and concrete proposals on ways of verifying a nuclear test ban, including on-site inspections, make it possible to solve also this problem.

The logic is simple: with no tests, there will be no upgrading of nuclear weapons of which both sides already have more than enough.

The side refusing to halt nuclear testing is demonstrating most visually its reluctance to agree to any accord to reduce the risk of outbreak of a nuclear war at all.

The present U.S. Administration's obstructionist posturing on the Soviet proposal for an end to nuclear explosions is showing distinctly the true meaning of the U.S. "disarmament concept".

During the 13 months after the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium, Washington has responded with 19 nuclear blasts to worldwide public demands for an end to all nuclear testing.

The U.S. Administration has clearly been out to make the people put up with the arms race as something inevitable, but this is an unfeasible task.

The stakes are too great. The question is one of preserving the very life on earth.

This is why Washington's latest "no" cannot and should not be seen as the final answer.

Sooner or later, even the most reckless adventurers in the United States will have to reckon with the people's right to life and put the interests of mankind before the interests of the U.S. military-industrial complex.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV REPORT ON MONITORING STATION IN KAZAKHSTAN

LD032110 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Sep 86

[Report by V. Lyashko from Kazakhstan, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Several nuclear tests carried out by the United States recently have been registered by U.S. instruments set up here in central Kazakhstan. The joint Soviet-U.S. experiment on monitoring nuclear tests is expanding.

A new seismic station, in addition to the one operating at Karkaralinsk, has been set up. A third will start work soon. [Video shows scientists with their equipment out of doors, against the background of a sparsely wooded hillside]

The first results of the experiment prove quite clearly that technical resources can be used to reliably monitor nuclear tests, no matter where they are held. All the participants in the experiment said this.

Asked how Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent statement was received, David Chavez said that he was very pleased to hear about the latest extension of the Soviet moratorium. This yet again shows that the Soviet people sincerely wish to put an end to nuclear tests. This is a good example for the United States. Recently, David Chavez continues, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution calling on the administration to ban nuclear tests once reliable monitoring of such tests was instituted. In this connection, I am confident that the work of our mixed group can make a major contribution to the attainment of a ban on tests.

His colleague from the University of California, (Dave Carroll), added that he completely supports Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement and expressed the hope that the U.S. Administration would, in the end, heed the USSR's proposals and take a similar step, for the sake of banning nuclear tests.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW 27 AUGUST PRESS CONFERENCE ON TEST BAN, SALT II, SDI

Broadcast on TV

LD282326 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1505 GMT 29 Aug 86

[Press conference on Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations at USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center on 27 August chaired by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of APN; and Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy, member of the Committee of Scientists in Struggle for Peace and Against Nuclear Threat and chief editor of KHIMIYA VYSOKIKH ENERGIY magazine -- recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Comrades, today we are repeating the reportage about the press-conference at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the subject of the new Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations. The press conference took place on 27 August.

[Gerasimov] Comrades, ladies and gentlemen. Today's press conference is devoted to the theme of "The New Soviet Peace Initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations". Taking part in the press conference are Georgiy Arkadiyevich Arbatov, academician, and director of the Institute of the United States of America and Canada; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of the APN: and Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy, academician, and member of the Committee of Scientists in the Struggle for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat and editor-in-chief of the magazine KHIMYA VYSOKIKH ENERGIY. Academician Arbatov will make some introductory remarks:

[Arbatov] I think the question might arise for those attending of why, indeed, 2 days after the last conference there is once again a press conference on a fairly close theme. It is first of all because it is a very important theme. We are indeed at an historic crossroads, and whether we go along the path of reducing armaments and ensuring genuine security -- and in our day and age these concepts in practice amount to the same thing -- or whether we enter upon a period of a totally unrestricted arms race and genuine nuclear chaos will depend on the decisions that are adopted in the very near future. The problem is a large and complex one and is very important. Undoubtedly it merits not just one, and not two, but indeed a host of press conferences, discussions and a broad, open [otkrytyy] dialogue, because, however everything ends, I think it will be a shameful thing if a sorry end awaits us through misunderstandings and ignorance of what we could explain to each other on particular issues.

The second reason is that in our view Soviet policy has in the United States and certain other Western countries become the object of massive disinformation and fairly malicious distortions both on the part of governments and also, I must unfortunately say, on the part of the mass information media. The latest Soviet proposals have even been running into a kind of conspiracy of silence. Just imagine for yourself a mirror-image situation, where the United States for 1 year has not conducted nuclear explosions and, moreover, it is saying that it is extending their great nuclear fast for a half a year more. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is continuing to explode one bomb after another and its mass information media are simply keeping silent about it. I can imagine what biblical wrath the U.S. press, television, and radio would be pouring upon us from day to day, and probably rightly so. Here we have a completely different situation.

Here there is a silence and people are evidently afraid to write about us and about what we are saying and doing. Altogether the signs are that the administration has seriously gotten at the mass information media and that now support for the administration's line or at least nonopposition to it has become something like a test of loyalty. People are probably having to keep silent under the threat that they will be accused of anti-Americanism.

Well, in general the government has been interfering. Probably here among us there is the NBC correspondent. An interesting series of dialogue programs, for instance, was planned, in which our most eminent personages -- the foreign ministers, the defense ministers, the chiefs of the general staffs and perhaps even leaders -- would have taken part. The U.S. Government countermanded this and NBC apologized for it all coming to nothing.

But, if one is speaking of the United States itself, then on questions of security and foreign policy the press and television there are kept on such short rations that it is difficult for them to say anything sensible. I think that otherwise they would not seize so greedily on every word spoken by Mr Larry Speakes.

It's as if, at his innumerable briefings, he were serving up juicy fresh steaks, and not bare bones that have long ago been picked clean many times. Now a few words on the substance of the matter. It is becoming clearer all the time that the cessation of nuclear explosions is not a measure of secondary importance. It is not a political gesture, or even simply a symbol of goodwill. Rather, it is a major and highly important practical step -- I emphasize that: A practical step - toward stopping the nuclear arms race and abolishing the nuclear threat.

The fact is that the nuclear tests that are being carried out today have nothing to do with the deterrence by which they are constantly being justified.

They have nothing to do with the declarative doctrines to which loyalty is constantly being sworn in the United States. The quantity of already-tested nuclear weapons that have been stockpiled is such that if we reduce it not only twofold, but threefold, fourfold or fivefold, we'll still have more than enough left for deterrence. If any doubts remained on this score, I think they must have been dispelled since the Chernobyl disaster.

No. Tests are being carried out today, not to develop weapons of deterrence, but to develop weapons with which they intend to wage, and hope to win, a nuclear war, contrary to all the declarations that both these are impossible. This has been said both orally and in writing. The U.S. President signed the latest of them in Geneva, during the summit meeting. It was a statement saying he agreed that nuclear war cannot

be waged and that there will be no victors. That is really the only purpose of continuing the tests. All the other explantions -- the diffculty of inspection, the problem of reliability, or the supposed superiority of the Soviet Union -- are entirely without foundation. On all these problems, may colleagues and I are willing, if it's of interest to the audience, to give appropriate answers -- as well as answering other questions you may have.

[Gerasimov] Now may we have your questions, please. [Correspondent] If the United States participates in the moratorium on nuclear explosions -- we have already been informed about this at a press conference a week ago and about what possibilities this would open up for an improvement of the situation regarding preserving peace. I am also interested in what possibilities this would open up for improving relations between the two countries, the Soviet Union and the United States. We have heard that recently U.S. scientists were here and that they reached agreement with Soviet scientists on cooperation in the field of thermonuclear fusion. There are also at present several interesting undertakings inthe field of culture. The Moiseyev ensemble is going to the United States. How do you now assess the situation between the two countries? Can one now say that there has been a little progress in this respect?

[Falin] As you know, last November in Geneva, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States acknowledged the need for concrete measures to improve Soviet-U.S. relations as part of the process of improving the world situation as a whole. It was agreed in this connection that the efforts of both sides would be undertaken in the interests of stopping the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space. It was envisaged that at a meeting that it was intended, and is still intended, to hold in 1986, these joint and unilateral efforts would be reviewed so that we might consolidate the positive result and move on from there. Speaking during his trip to the Far East, Mikhail Sergeyevich drew attention to the fact that there was no agreement to meet in any case, regardless of the situation and regardless of what the sides were doing, separately and together, simply in order to get together. We see no point in meeting just for the sake of meeting.

Naturally, when it comes to solving problems, the state selects those where conditions are ripe, where the best prerequisities exist for asserting, not in words, but in deeds, which is positive and for the sake of which the efforts are being undertaken.

The question of halting nuclear weapon tests is today, technically and politically the most simple question of this nature. It is simple because the Soviet Union has for a year now not been conducting tests and simply because there is a need first and foremost for goodwill on the part of the United States in order to resolve this question.

During the current year the Soviet Union has put forward various options as a formulation of such an accord. Unfortunately, not one of these options has been accepted by the U.S. side and, if one judges by the facts, was not even seriously considered. But the Soviet leadership, proceeding not just from some technical, prestige or other considerations, is insisting on a resolution of this issue, since the testing or nontesting of nuclear weapons is the answer to the question of what the two powers want for the future: Do they want a further expansion of the preparations for nuclear war or have they decided seriously to turn back events in this sphere and to act to remove the atom from the world and to create more stable and more humane conditions for the existence of the international community.

[Arbatov] I'd like to add a couple of words: Well, you see, it's good that he Moiseyev ensemble will travel to the United States. Americans, after a long break, will probably watch it with pleasure. An exchange has begun between scientists, not without resistance from the U.S. Government to begin with, but now cooperation is somehow reviving, and all of this.... [changes thought] but behind such concrete, partial, and positive phenomena, we can't lose sight of the main thing: that on the main questions, Soviet-U.S. relations have not only absolutely not improved, but also that movement is continuing in a dangerous direction, in the direction of a worsening. It's difficult to imagine how the United States plans the meetings. I can't imagine how that can be, to tell the truth; it ought to take place either a couple of weeks after the United States withdraws from SALT, which its government has promised, or on the eve of that event. Well what can one say about in these conditions? An offensive is underway on all of those albeit modest limitations on the arms race that were created by already existing treaties, in order to torpedo the very possibility of talks.

[Gerasimov] If the United States once again gets military activity underway, in Libya for example, what will the reaction of the USSR be and will the moratorium be halted? - This question is asked by the First Channel of FRG television.

[Arbatov] Well you see at the time when the first piratical act was carried out against Libya we did not break off the moratorium. We cancelled the meeting between Shultz and Shevardnadze. I'm not going to start guessing about what will happen now. I hope all the same that it will not be repeated.

[Falin] We're talking about the latest military demonstration, and a typical demonstration of force, a typical buildup of U.S. sabre rattling efforts, which, of course, destablize the situation, not only in that region, but also in the wider sense.

[Unidentified CSSR reporter] A question for Academician Arbatov from Czechoslovak televison. What in your view will be the reaction of the Soviet Union in the event that the United States stops observing SALT II?

[Arbatov] Well, you see, this will be a blow to the entire system of treaties. Strictly speaking, in the United States too many people understand that in direct terms, this will inflict a greater loss even to the interests of the United States than to the Soviet Union. In this treaty the main restrictions on the United States were included in a 2-year protocol, which has long expired, and for us they are in the treaty itself, and are observed. So the direct result will be that we will have the opportunity of very rapidly, and at the cost of only a small expense, increasing our strategic forces, and I am not sure that the United States will be given anything, and this forms the basis for the partial opposition in the United States to this step. But the political consequences will be very bad.

I don't see how one can talk about the United States wanting a reduction in nuclear weapons, starting from liquidating even those modest restrictions that have already been brought on for this. Of course, this will create difficulties for the whole dialogue and for all meetings that are contemplated.

[Falin] There are two sides to the question you are asking, what comes after the restrictions of SALT II have ended, and the wider question, the political, legal and so on. The well-known Kenneth Adelman, explaining the reason why the United States refused to ratify this treaty, the SALT II, said that ratification of the SALT II would have signified the transfer into the 1980's of those principles on which the process of strategic offensive weapons limitation was based. These principles, Adelman said,

would have become a kind of law for the United States, which would not suit the present administration at all. So here in essence the question of the principles on which talks have to be conducted in the future too i at the present stage the main one. Either the United States recognizes the principle of equality and equal security, or they do not recognize it. Either the United States considers internatonal security to be something common to states, or they will, as they say, act proceeding from the requirements of only their own security, more precisely, proceeding from their understanding of the requirements of their own security, and ignoring the interests and requirements of other states. That is the fundamental question on which a response has to be given, and a precise answer.

[TASS reporter Vashedchenko] It was pointed out in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement that the Soviet Union will find a way of devaluing the Americans' so-called strategic initiative, and essentially the star wars program. How would you comment on this statement?

[Goldanskiy] I think here one can say the following words: There is some kind of level of stability through mutual deterrence, and at the present time the question of what that level should be and what is the level of sufficient offensive armament in order that this level might be maintained, is the subject of talks. Now there arises the so-called shield, an umbrella that is supposed to be fully reliable, but in actual fact is a leaky umbrella. But we're not going to talk about that now.

It is much cheaper and much more effective, even from the point of view of international security, to counter this self same anti-missile defense, this star wars program, with methods that will effectively dash, so to speak, hopes for this self same anti-missile defense, hopes that one side will be completely protected, and under this protection it will be able to make the first strike and do everything it likes.

[Gerasimov] I recall that the U.S. General Omar Bradley once said that if for a missile you invent an anti-missile, and for an anti-anti-missile you can invent anti-anti-anti-missile. In other words, you will have an endless, vicious circle of an arms race, so it is better to call a halt.

[Arbatov] Generally speaking, in my opinion, apart from Reagan, hardly anybody in the United States believes in this shield. Everyone has in his own mind -- various groups have completely different SDI's in mind. One of the most popular is the SDI as a means of economic undermining of the Soviet Union. In this respect, this a very vital element, the fact that we will not submit to this. They want this very much. A group of our scientists have just arrived from Erice and they say that the Americans from Livermore have simply been urging them: Look, let's build the SDI together. There are some people present here who have been to Erice. Let's build together.

Come to our laboratories -- I, of course, am not sure whether they would let us in if we did agree. But, why is this? Because they are calculating on undermining us economically, and therefore, we would like to say in advance that this will not happen. The Americans, by the way, are already undermining themselves, by this excessive military expenditure.

[Unidentified reporter from the Soviet television, "Vremya" program] Judging from news coming in, the idea has emerged lately in the United States that somehow all the questions connected with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit have already been decided.

For example, Speakes, the White House spokesman, speaking in this vein, said recently that if the meeting takes place, fine, but if it doesn't take place, then that's really not too bad, either. How would you comment on such a mood, and on such a statement?

[Arbatov] Well, as you see, such attention is already being paid to Speakes even in our country and not only in the United States. [Arbatov laughs]

You know, generally speaking, an attempt is being made -- I think Valentin Mikhaylovich already said as much -- to substitute for the main issue of the Geneva accord, that both sides committed themselves to take measures toward a normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations, an improvement in the international situation, and a speeding up of the process of talks on arms limitation; to substitute for this the issue about the meeting and to substitute the issue of the means for the issue of the end. This, generally speaking, is a deliberate falsification, as is the falsification about the way things are today. As far as I understand it, absolutely nothing has changed, and two decisive points still remain on this meeting, which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about. The first is the political atmosphere and the second is that the meeting must yeild results. The rest is all a needless complication.

[Gerasimov] [Words indistinct] I would like now to read a question that I have next to me from FRG television. As General Secretary Gorbachev stated, a summit meeting must lead to a specific agreement on disarmament at least in one sphere. What sphere do you see as the most likely for such an agreement?

[Falin] The first comment I would like to make is about what Speakes said: It does not matter to us whether there is a meeting or not. And if there is a meeting, fine; we will get by if there is not one. This demonstrates the arrogance and conceit that is shown in their statements about their positions by such representatives -- certain representatives, anyway -- of the U.S. side. They might as well say: We do not care if there is a war or not. There can be tension, or the world can be a better place; we do not care. The U.S. people will survive, so be it. We believe -- and this has been stated more than once lately at the very highest level in our country -- that in practical terms the most urgent question is that of ending nuclear tests. This is the question of ending the improvement of weapons, the question of ending work on imparting to these weapons the nature of conventional weapons that could be used in conventional military operations, including against non-nuclear countries -- as we know arises from the charter of the U.S. Armed Forces -- so that is this regard, nothing irreparable occurs. What is ncessary are deeds; enough words have been said already.

[Unidentified correspondent from Czechoslovak Telegraphic Agency] One of the U.S. main arguments against an end to nuclear explosions is that these explosions are necessary for the reliability of nuclear weapons.

Comrade Arbatov has touched upon this problem. I have this question: The Soviet Union has not conducted any nuclear tests for over a year. Does this problem not worry you, do you not have any fears for the Soviet Union's nuclear security?

[Goldanskiy] In answering this question, I have to take up a little of your time explaining some scientific-technical aspects of the problem. A more than sufficient level of armaments has already been stockpiled for the deterrence of war and in this regard, tests are unnecessary. Therefore all the tests being carried out are indeed tests aimed at waging war. At this point, I would like to tell you a little about, so to speak, the essence of the matter. Perhaps I...

[Arbatov, interrupting] the reliability...

[Goldanskiy] Perhaps I will be speaking about what is common knowledge and in that event do excuse me. Well, what then are nuclear weapons? They are sometimes, so to speak, surrounded by a halo of mystery. What then are the components of these weapons? The nuclear components, the fission components, are plutonium or uranium-235, which is the initial core, and uranium-238, which is a hybrid and makes, so to speak, a hybrid bomb, which contains both this core, and then thermonuclear components and then uranium-238, which is split by fast neutrons. With regard to the lifespan of these nuclear components, the shortest-lived of them, plutonium-24, has a period of thousands of years as its half-life. Uranium-235 has 800 million years and uranium-238, 4.500 billion years. The thermonuclear components are either lithium deuteride 6d, which is altogether stable in the nuclear sense, or a tritium deuteride mixture. Tritium is a most unstable component in the nuclear sense. It has a half-life of 12.5 years. All these component parts that go into a bomb and go into a projectile can be checked without any nuclear test. Each of these components can be tested separately. There now exist many remarkable methods that have been devised for nondestructive monitoring such as flaw-detection and introscopy, that is peering inside the substance, as it were.

[Arbatov] More cheaply, no doubt.

[Goldanskiy] Much more cheaply, which makes it possible to be certain here. Now the following simple example alone indicates that there need be no doubt, so to speak, about this possibility. You know that a threshold treaty has been in operation since 1974, under which explosions with a power of more than 150 kilotons are not carried out. It would appear, therefore, that all warheads that are in service and that have a power of more than 150 kilotons are apparently unreliable [Goldanskiy chuckles] because test explosions of this kind have not been carried out since 1974. Nothing of the kind! I can name five types of U.S. warheads for you as examples; the B-28, which is almost 1.5 megatons; there is the B-43, which is 1 megaton; there is the B-53 which is 9 megatons; the V-53, or rather the W-53, which is 9 megatons; there is the W-56 which is 1.2 megatons. These are among the armaments...

[Arbatov interrupting] And no one doubts their reliability.

[Goldanskiy] And no one doubts their reliability, so to speak, no one says that this depends on continuing the relevant underground tests.

[Gerasimov] Although the subject of our conference is the Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations, clearly none of this is all that interesting for the U.S. correspondents. There are no replies to questions from them; no doubt, like Speakes, it makes no difference to them. So I am all the more appreciative of the fact that THE WASHINGTON POST correspondent has raised his hand. Please go ahead:

[Unidentified U.S. correspondent speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] I would like to return to the question of the summit meeting. A reappraisal has taken place during the past 2 days among U.S. officials. They say that a positive atmosphere has appeared, taking into consideration the contacts in Moscow, Geneva, and Washington. I would like to ask whether the Soviet-U.S. consultations have brought the possibility of a summit meeting any closer? Is it possible to hope that some results will be achieved at this meeting?

[Arbatov] We are in favor of these consultations, but their main purpose is not to create the illusion that we are obtaining well-being, but to elucidate what both sides are really prepared to do. No doubt it is still too early now to give a final answers to this question, because we are right in the middle of the consultations themselves. All of them must be continued. So far we have not seen any results from them, but

perhaps they were not to have been expected. But, all of this must make it clear: These are only consultations and here they are commiting a falsification in the United States: These are not preparations for a summit meeting, these are preparations for a meeting between Shultz and Shevardnadze.

[Gerasimov] Well, we have got into replies to questions from U.S. correspondents. There is a question from Mr. Daniloff representing U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT. Virtually every day the United States says that it will not agree. So why insist so stubbornly on banning tests? Diplomacy is the art of the possible. Question: Do you believe that at the last minute the United States will soften its stance?

[Arbatov] You know, it very often happens in politics that things happen, things start, only when it is no longer possible to do nothing.

I think that the United States will change its position when it becomes clear to the leaders that it cannot be otherwise, that they cannot but change their position, that this will be the entire situation both in the country and in the alliance and in the world, in public opinion everywhere. I still believe that this force exists. You know, all the same, something is happening, these movements toward a new political way of thinking are taking place. I recall that recently I was discussing Chernobyl with one of my U.S. friends, and he said to me; you know, completely new approaches are suggesting themselves. The most terrible thing that the Soviet Union could do to the United States is to detonate all of its nuclear warheads on its own territory. Then rapid and almost painless death would befall you, and we, the Americans, would have to die a prolonged death, in torment and nightmares. Yes, indeed, one aspect of this entirely new situation is that we are being drawn all the time to some kind of traditional, old, medieval or prenuclear, approaches to problems. I hope that this does not remain so for long. It is an unnatural situation. This is the detachment from reality that we can observe in U.S. policy today. Do you believe that the majority of people in the world are in favor of a complete ban on tests and will put pressure on the United States to change its position? It is not a question of believing it, you see, we quite simply know that 80 percent of people living in the United States itself, according to an opinion poll, oppose tests. Will this exert influence? The answer to that question depends on how effective U.S. democracy is, on the extent to which the government responds to the will of the people, so to speak.

[Gerasimov] And of world public opinion too.

[Arbatov] Yes. World public opinion, too, is, of course, opposed to tests. We do not just believe this, we are sure of it. It applies to leaders, too, not just public opinion, but to the leaders of the majority of countries.

It is not influencing the United States yet, but it is a political factor. Is not the reason you are insisting upon a complete ban this, that in the event of the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting appearing to be less successful you will place the blame on the United States? Well in the first place, I do not think there will be a meeting if there is not going to be any chance of success, any chance of success at all on major questions. That is what follows -- as far as I understand it -- from what Comrade Gorbachev has said. I have already spoken about the political side, both the political atmosphere and the content of the meeting itself. And second, we should not be suspected of having such jesuit schemes. We really do want to end tests and lower the nuclear threat, and I think this is something everyone should want.

[Unidentified CSSR radio correspondent] It is known that President Reagan's administration has not signed a single treaty with the Soviet Union on limiting the nuclear arms race.

Are there any grounds to speak today of motives that would lead to a change in Washington's stance?

[Arbatov] I don't see any as yet. It seems to me that what can be discerned is something rather different. I won't venture to speak personally and personify that policy, but in U.S. policy as a whole, what is discernable is something else: A desire to hurry up and destroy as much as possible by 1988, so that afterwards even the successors of the present administration will have a hard job restoring it.

[Unidentified reporter] Wouldn't you sometmes say that you, the Soviet side, have been too optimistic in assessing the possibility of reaching agreement with the present U.S. Administration and that following the Geneva meeting your calculations have included too many optimistic factors, so to speak.

[Arbatov] Well in the first place, you see, I would like to say that no doubt we did have different opinions after Geneva and we debated among ourselves a good deal on this subject. I do not see anywhere here where we might have deviated in that way toward optimism. What did we do? We went to Geneva with this desire, and we had it after Geneva, to use every opportunity to break the deadlock and halt this dangerous slippage toward disaster. In this respect, I think despite the hardening the U.S. policy, I think that Geneva was a great event, if only because it helped us to think through, to work out and to put forward a whole series of new initiatives that seem to me to have helped move forward the level of the whole political thinking in the world: and in the final analysis we have to understand that there's more to the world than the United States, and that the United States didn't begin with the present administration and I hope that it won't end with it. This is a long-term policy, it is a policy carried out for the sake of very important objectives and I think what has been done is of great and lasting importance.

[Falin] I would like to recall in connection with your question what was said at the 27th Congress, that the Soviet Union does not equate international relations, the international community, to the Soviet Union and the United States, to Soviet-U.S. relations. We consider the world to be so close-packed and so interlinked that the contribution of each state and each region to ensuring security and reducing the threat of war is inestimable, extremely important, and naturally we would welcome such a contribution. Even the problem of nuclear weapons tests also affects Western Europe, if only because Great Britain, too, carries out test explosions at U.S. testing sites. That's no secret, either.

[Gerasimov] Well, we're already glancing at the clock, and here's a question from the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, for Academician Arbatov -- and it's about clocks: In your book, "Entering the Eighties" [Vstupaya v vosmidesyatiy], you mentioned the symbolic clock on the cover of the journal ATOMIC SCIENCE BULLETIN ["BYULLETEN UCHENYKH ATOMSHCHIKOV"]. In 1980, the clock's hands were moved from 1151 to 1153; a year later, the clock showed the time as 1156. What time would you set the symbolic clock at today, after the extension of Soviet moratorium?

[Arbatov] Well, I'd put it like this: I'd say that at present there are two hands grasping that knob by which the hands of the clock are moved: One is trying to turn them back, turn the hand back, as far back as possible, and perhaps later even sweep this nuclear clock off the table altogether; while the other is stubbornly nudging it forward toward the fateful brink. We are hovering on that decisive borderline; and whose hand is the stronger is not just something that the future will show. I think it depends on us all: On the Europeans, the Asians, the Americans, and the Soviets -- all of us. It's our decision.

[Goldanskiy] As chess is so much in the news just now, I would add that we must all try to ensure that the flag doesn't fall. That's the main thing!

[Gerasimov] Valentin Mikhaylovich, what's your opinion?

[Falin] My opinion is that for a long time, the clock has been a symbol; now, it's become a reality. In a situation in which U.S. first-strike weapons have been deployed, and missiles take 6 to 8 minutes to reach their target, 54 minutes already corresponds to a real disposition of forces. We are living 6 minutes away from war. Indeed, if we assume and presuppose that the Americans were to begin to implement the SDI programs, then mankind would be living 30 seconds away from war, when any short-circuit in the system that is called the Strategic Defense Initiative would entail irreversible consequences. Therefore the issue of moving the clockhand backwards or of removing the clock from the table, as Academician Arbatov said, is a task for all of mankind, and it is an extremely pressing task, for the clock is going and it is counting out the time that you and I have.

[Gerasimov] The time for our press conference has elapsed. Till we meet again!

PRAVDA Report

PM281009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[N. Bragin report: "Time for Action: Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] "Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-American relations" -- that was the subject of a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center yesterday. Taking part were prominent Soviet scientists and specialists on international questions.

The complex, tense situation in the world, Academician G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, stated in his speech, requires broad, open dialogue on the vital problems of current international relations. Whether the world will follow the path of arms reduction and genuine security, or enter a phase of totally unrestricted arms race chaos depends on how these problems are resolved. The times urgently dictate the need for concrete actions to deliver mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe that hangs over him. This is the aim of the new peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union. Not only broad public circles, but also the governments of many countries have highly assessed the Soviet leadership's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions, V.M. Falin, chairman of the APN board, said responding to a question. In Western Europe and throughout the world there is a growing demand for the United States to respond to the Soviet Union's appeal to stop nuclear tests and start talks on ending them entirely.

However, as stressed at the press conference, Washington remains deaf to these appeals and resorts to malicious distortion of the objectives of the Soviet proposals and totally unconcealed disinformation. The U.S. press, as if by order, is organizing a conspiracy of silence over the positive reaction in the world to the USSR's peace initiatives. Only yesterday, at a press conference, we saw how restrained the American journalists were: only one or two questions. Even then we do not know whether the answers to them, and indeed to other journalists' questions, will be published in the United States. The American Administration, it was stated at the press conference, has

taken control of the mass media's reporting of the Soviet proposals. U.S. newspapermen are rather afraid to tell the truth about us and our policy and about how we assess the U.S. Administration's present approach to Soviet-American relations.

It was stated frankly at the press conference that the American side has done nothing, since Geneva, to improve Soviet-American relations. Moreover it avoids fulfilling the important accords reached during the summit meeting. Instead of seeking ways of tackling the problems associated with disarmament and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, Washington steps up the arms race.

I asked: What is the technical and military-political purpose of Washington's stubbornly continuing its nuclear tests? The answer was clear. The U.S. Administration, Academician V.I. Goldanskiy stated, is conducting these tests exclusively in order to improve nuclear weapons and create new types of such weapons. Assertions that in the course of the tests they are checking the condition of weapons created earlier are, from the technical viewpoint, unsubstantiated. As, incidentally, are the claims that the continuation of tests is dictated by U.S. national interests.

Answering journalists' questions about the prospects for a new meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, the conference participaants stressed that everything depends on whether the American side is ready at the meeting, which was and still is planned for 1986, for concrete actions to limit the arms race and end nuclear tests.

The time for action has come. The historic chance to stop the slide toward nuclear catastrophe must not be wasted.

TASS Report

PM281141 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 27 August was devoted to the new Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-American relations. Participating in the conference were Academician G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States of America and Canada; V.M. Falin, chairman of the board of the APN; and V.I. Goldanskiy, member of the Committee of Scientists in the Struggle for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat.

In his introductory address G.A. Arbatov said:

We are at a historic crossroads in terms of the decisions that will be adopted in the very near future. On them will depend whether we take the path of reducing arms and ensuring genuine security -- which in our age are practically synonymous concepts -- or whether we enter a period of a totally unrestricted arms race and real nuclear chaos. It is a great, complex, and very important problem and undoubtedly merits a multitude of press conferences and discussions and a broad, open dialogue.

Soviet policy has become, in the United States and in certain other Western countries, an object of massive misinformation and quite malicious distortions, both on the part of the government and, unfortunately, on the part of the mass media. The latest Soviet proposals are even coming up against a kind of conspiracy of silence.

People there keep quiet about what we say and do. The U.S. Administration, by all accounts, has taken the mass media seriously in hand. Support for its line or, at least, nonopposition to it has now become something like a test of loyalty, and you have to keep quiet, probably, under threat of being denounced and accused of anti-Americanism. To speak of the United States itself, on matters of security and foreign policy the press and television there are kept on such starvation rations that it is difficult for them to say anything intelligible, otherwise they would not seize so avidly on every word of Mr L. Speakes.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the ending of nuclear explosions is not a secondary measure, not a political gesture, nor even just a symbol of goodwill. It is a major, very important practical step on the way to ending the nuclear arms race and eliminating the nuclear threat. The point is that the nuclear tests being carried out today have nothing to do with deterrence -- which is how they are constantly justified -- and have nothing to do with the declarative doctrines to which the United States is constantly swearing loyalty. So many nuclear weapons, long since tested, have been stockpiled that, if they were reduced not just twofold but threefold, fourfold. fivefold, there would still be more than enough left to act as a deterrent.
If there were any doubts about this, they should have been dispelled after the disaster at Chernobyl. No, tests are not being carried out today to create [sozdaniye] weapons of deterrence but to create [sozdaniye] weapons with whose help they are reckoning on waging and hoping to win a nuclear war, contrary to ali declarations, verbal and written. This, on the whole, is the sole purpose of continuing tests. All declarations about difficulties of inspection [proverka] and about the Soviet Union's imaginary superiority are totally groundless.

Answers were given to numerous questions from journalists.

Question: If the United States participates in the moratorium on nuclear tests, what opportunities does this open up for improving the international situation as a whole, as well as for improving relations between the United States and the USSR? Has there been any progress in Soviet-American relations since the Geneva summit meeting?

Answer: As you know, in Geneva last November M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan recognized the need for specific measures to improve Soviet-American relations as part of the process of improving the situation in the world as a whole. In this connection it was agreed that both sides would make efforts in the interests of ending the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space. It was intended that these joint and bilateral efforts would be summed up at the meeting which they planned and still plan to hold in 1986 in order to move forward, having consolidated the positive result.

The Soviet Union has not conducted nuclear weapon tests for a year now. Goodwill is also required of the United States. We have proposed various options for drawing up corresponding accords. Unfortunately, not one of these options has been accepted by the American side or, to judge from the facts, has even been considered seriously.

Although some cooperation between the USSR and the United States has recently been seen to revive in certain spheres, on basic issues Soviet-American relations have not only not improved but are continuing to move in a dangerous direction, in the direction of deterioration. This applies to the arms race, to regional conflicts, to the U.S. pursuit of a policy of globalism in the international arena, and, if you like, even to the rhetoric we hear from the United States.

Question: How will the concentration of American military forces around Libya affect relations between the United States and the USSR? Will the USSR not end its moratorium in this connection?

Answer: We did not cancel the moratorium when the United States carried out its first piratical action against Libya. If we speak to the point about the Soviet side's attitude toward the present concentration of American forces in the Mediterranean region and to the U.S. threat to Libya, naturally no state that takes a responsible approach to questions of peace and security can remain indifferent to this. It is a question of a typical show of force and saber rattling. This destabilizes the situation not only in that region but also throughout the world.

Question: What will the Soviet Union's reaction be if the United States ceases to observe the SALT II treaty?

Answer: That would be a blow to the entire regime of treaties. The political consequences would also be very bad.
Will it be possible to say that America wants a nuclear arms reduction if it eliminates the modest limitations introduced already? And, of course, difficulties will arise for the entire Soviet-American dialogue and for all the proposed meetings.

Question: Does the Soviet Union's repeated extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions have any impact on the awareness of broad sections of the American public in the direction of transforming the stereotypes of the Soviet Union that are foisted on it? And is such a shift possible in the sentiments of American voters in the very near future in favor of supporting politicians who advocate talks rather than confrontation with the Soviet Union?

Answer: We do not want our policy to be perceived as interference in U.S. internal affairs, in its political processes and elections. That is their affair. But it must be frankly stated that it is very hard for our truth to get through to the Americans. A real iron curtain has been set up. But there are grounds for believing that, nonetheless, anti-Soviet stereotypes are being destroyed. As Lincoln said, you can't fool all the people all the time.

Question: M.S. Gorbachev's statement points out that the Soviet Union will find a means of depreciating the American so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, essentially the "star wars" program. How would you comment on that statement?

Answer: We have in mind technical measures that could be used to neutralize an ABM defense itself. It is clear to everyone that it is far easier to neutralize objects in stationary orbits than flying objects -- warheads. These measures could include various kinds of space means that could at a certain moment be aimed at neutralizing an ABM defense. This is a far less costly path.

Therefore, the hopes of bringing about the economic ruin of our national economy by drawing us into a race to create [sozdaniye] an ABM defense are vain hopes. It is possible to find an effective counter to the ABM program without any serious economic expenditure, still less on the scale the United States plans for this.

Question: The Soviet Union has not conducted nuclear tests for more than a year. Are there any fears in this connection for the Soviet Union's nuclear security?

Answer: A more than adequate level of armament has already been accumulated to deter war. Tests are not needed here. Therefore, all the tests that are conducted are tests aimed at waging war.

Question: Almost every day the Soviet Union calls for a nuclear test ban, and almost every day the United States declares that it will not agree with this. Why, then, insist so stubbornly on a test ban? Diplomacy is the art of the possible. My question is: Do you believe that the United States will soften its position at the last moment?

Answer: You know that it very frequently happens in politics that people only start to act when it is no longer possible not to act. Therefore it is necessary to struggle very persistently for every advance. No, the United States does not agree to the moratorium for the time being. But if you recall what Reagan and his entourage were saying in the early eighties, you will see some cosmetic shifts in their position. At that time they objected to any talks and spoke of us only as the "evil empire."

I believe that the United States will change its position on the moratorium when it becomes clear to its leaders that it is impossible to live otherwise and that this is an unnatural situation.
Today we are observing that U.S. policy is greatly out of touch with reality.

Question: Do you believe that the majority in the world, advocating a total test ban, is putting pressure on the United States to change its position?

Answer: We know that, according to a poll, 80 percent of U.S. inhabitants themselves are opposed to tests. But whether this will influence the U.S. Administration is a question of how effective American democracy is and how far the administration takes the people's will into account. And, of course, world public opinion is also against tests. We are sure of this. This does not yet influence Washington, but this is a political factor.

Answers were also given to other questions from journalists.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: JAPANESE PROTEST AGAINST U.S. SHIP CALL

TBS TV Poll Taken

LD012110 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 1 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo September 1 TASS -- A poll sponsored by the TBS television network in connection with the visit of a large American naval task force which includes warships armed with nuclear-tipped tomahawk missiles, revealed that 62 percent of Japanese believe that the government should have given permission to the American battleship New Jersey to enter a Japanese port. The visit of the task (?force), numbering an unprecedented 11 warships, triggered a wave of protests (?and) demonstrations that have swept the country. Mayor of the port of Sasebo, Kumashi Kakeshi, who hailed the visit of New Jersey only a week ago, now said it was imperative that the Japanese government negotiate with the United States the observance of the non-nuclear status of the country.

Socialist Party, TU's Meet

LD020828 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 2 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo September 2 TASS -- Activists of the Socialist Party and the General Council of the Trade Unions of Japan held a meeting in a wharf of the Sasebo Port today in protest against the entry of American nuclear-capable ships into Japanese waters. Speaking at the meeting, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party Masashi Ishibashi strongly denounced official Tokyo which follows the course of the country's growing involvement in the Pentagon's strategy. He demanded strict compliance with the official ban on bringing nuclear weapons into Japan. A U.S. strike Naval squadron led by the battleship New Jersey with cruise missiles aboard left the Port of Sasebo today. The squadron stayed there for nine days.

'Attack' on Non-Nuclear Policy

LD281345 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 28 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 28 TASS -- By political news analyst Askold Biryukov: Another U.S. ship armed with nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles, the destroyer Merrill, entered the Japanese port of Sasebo last night to join the battleship New Jersey staying there since last Sunday. In another Japanese port, Yokosuka, there currently are the U.S. nuclear-powered guided-missile cruiser Long Beach and its escort, the

guided-missile frigate Thach. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI said this was the first time there were so many ships with Tomahawks on board calling at Japan.

Their visit to the country of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is seen as direct attack on the three non-nuclear principles underlying Japan's official policy. Its three leading opposition parties in their statements on this score ssid the port calls by the New Jersey and the other U.S. warships carrying Tomahawks were emasculating the non-nuclear principles as they represented a direct U.S. encroachment upon one of them, prohibiting nuclear weapons to be taken in to Japan. It is not the first year that the United States has been trying to reduce Japan's non-nuclear policy to nought through faits accomplis. U.S. aircraft-carriers and nuclear-powered submarines with nuclear munitions have occasionally been calling at its ports and U.S. F-16 nuclear-capable fighter-bombers have been deployed at the Misawa Air Base.

In connection with the current visit by U.S. naval ships the Japanese Government has become under domestic public pressure to ask Washington to give clear guarantees that the vessels are not carrying nuclear munitions. Japanese Foreign Minister Tabashi Kuranari requested U.S. ambassador to Japan Michael Mansfield to treat the "nuclear allergy" of his compatriots with understanding. Mansfield, however, limited himself to a standard reply, saying that the United States neither confirmed nor denied the presence of nuclear weapons on its ships, and the Japanese government found the response satisfying. What are the reasons for this position, considering the fact that there is ample evidence that the United States has for long been taking nuclear weapons into Japan on the sly? With the tacit concern of its authorities, Japan is gradually being converted into a nuclear staging area of the Pentagon in the West Pacific.

Former Foreign Minister Tosio Kimura has conceded in an interview with the newspaper ASAHI that there is a secret agreement between the United States and Japan, allowing the entry of nuclear weapons into the latter country. This fact was also confirmed by U.S. politicians and military men, including former ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer. Their remarks had indicated, the paper said, that the three non-nuclear principles were only used to deceive public opinion and obscure the danger posed to Japan by Washington's nuclear ambitions. The U.S. policy of nuclear blackmail and of stockpiling nuclear arms in the South-Pacific region has caused justified alarm among its nations.

This is seen from the position of the New Zealand Government, which has banned the use of the country's port facilities by ships with nuclear weapons on board, the determination of the South Pacific forum countries to make their region a nuclear-free zone, and growing public support in the ASEAN countries for declaring such a zone also in Southeast Asia. The nations of the region do not want to put up with Washington's attempts to turn it into a frontline for fighting a nuclear war. The Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA said justly a short time ago that the forces mad on war must not be allowed to turn the region into a mass grave for atomic bomb victims.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA REPORTS ON NEW ZEALAND NFZ LEGISLATION

PM041301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent O. Skalkin: "Labor Sums Up the Results"]

[Excerpt] Wellington, 2 Sep -- The New Zealand Labor Party conference, held a few days ago in Wellington, opened on a jubilant note. Less than 2 months ago the Labor Party celebrated its 70th anniversary, and the fact that the party marked this important date in its history while in power enhanced the significance of its annual meeting which examined key questions of the organization's current policy and strategic tasks.

Having given due credit to the past, the 716 conference delegates addressed the problems facing the country at present.

"Welcoming the government's antinuclear policy, the present conference simultaneously proposes the following additions to legislation on nuclear-free zone in New Zealand, disarmament, and arms control." This preamble to one of the proposals submitted for examination by the delegates is typical of the general mood of debates on international questions. The nuclear-free line followed by David Lange's Labor government (its well know elements are a ban on calls by foreign nuclear ships at New Zealand ports, the country's active role in creating a nuclear-free zone in the Southern Pacific, and other actions) is perceived by the party in its absolute majority as a success which has to be consolidated and developed through new active initiatives to strengthen peace.

A recommendation that the country should break away from the ANZUS bloc was adopted with complete unanimity by the entire hall and to the applause by delegates. It is supplemented by proposals for nonparticipation in any other military alliances; on withdrawal from military alliances with nuclear states; on a stance of positive neutrality by New Zealand which would include active promotion of peace treaties with all countries by its representatives; on opposition to the establishment of a naval base on Palau (Micronesia) by the United States; on establishment of diplomatic relations with Nicaragua and support for its heroic people against U.S. interventionism, and others.

According to current Labor Party procedures, conference recommendations are not directly mandatory for the government. They do, however, provide substantial material for the elaboration of the political manifesto which the party traditionally addresses to voters in advance of scheduled parliamentary elections. Moreover, the great moral effect of these proposals, backed by the authority of the party congress, is beyond dispute. It is well known, for example, that this was the origin of the principles now underlying New Zealand's foreign policy, including its well known antinuclear stance. This is why the newspaper DOMINION was fully justified in concluding with regard to the outcome of the conference's foreign policy debate: "The government found itself under renewed pressure by the party organization to intensify New Zealand's antinuclear stance." [passage omitted]

/9274
CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BEIJING REVIEW: SOVIET MOTIVES FOR NUCLEAR MORATORIUM

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English Vol 29, No 35, 1 Sep 86 p 13

[Article by Zhang Liang]

[Text]

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev announced on August 18 that the Soviet Union was extending its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing until January 1, 1987. At the same time, he again appealed to the United States to do the same. But the US government said it was not in accord with its security interests and rejected the suggestion.

This is the fourth such confrontation on the nuclear test issue between the two countries since last year. At the end of July 1985, the Soviet Union first proposed a moratorium on nuclear testing to commence on August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of the US atomic bombing of Hiroshima, and called on the United States to follow suit. The United States on the same day invited the Soviet Union to send an observer to the State of Nevada to monitor a nuclear test. Each side rejected the other's suggestion. The United States said the Soviet proposal was only propaganda, while the Soviet Union said the purpose of the United States in inviting a Soviet observer was to legalize its nuclear tests.

Since then the Soviet Union has used every opportunity to repeatedly urge a moratorium on nuclear tests, but has made no progress. In order to get a test ban, Gorbachev offered to discuss the issue with US President Ronald Reagan in Europe. The United States, however, was unwilling to hold a summit only on a moratorium on nuclear tests. It stated that a Soviet-US summit should involve all the problems existing between the two countries.

During the past year the battle of words between the two countries has continued, while the US has conducted another 18 underground tests. The Soviet Union has condemned the United States for its policy of nuclear confrontation, aimed at defeating Soviet efforts to end the arms race and seeking nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union, the United States has retorted that the goal of the Soviet Union in suggesting a test ban is to maintain the nulear superiority of itself. The two superpowersalso made excuses for themselves. One said a test ban was the most practical road to nuclear disarmament, the other that it was impossible to completely stop nuclear testing since there was still no reliable monitoring technique. What the United States wanted was to reduce offensive nuclear wesapons on both sides.

It is easy to see that both the US and the Soviet Union want superiority over the other. Western opinion is that the nuclear forces of each are about equal at present. In some fields, the Soviet Union has a dominant position. Considering its domestic economic situation, the Soviet government wants to preserve this equilibrium. It is also worried the United States could achieve superiority through the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), so it hopes to force the US to give it up. That is the real reason for the Soviet Union's repeated extension of its moratorium

/13046
CSO: 5200/4070

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR PLEDGES TO SIGN SOUTH PACIFIC NFZ PROTOCOLS

HK020257 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 27 Aug 86 p 3

[Text] When it has more information, the Soviet Union will definitely sign the protocols attached to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, says the visiting Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister.

Dr Mikhail Kapitsa gave this assurance at a press conference in Wellington yesterday.

He also said the Soviet Union would be willing to sign a bilateral "confidence building" agreement with New Zealand under which it would be the Soviets' task to inform this country whenever a Soviet warship was visiting the South Pacific.

Dr Kapitsa, in New Zealand from Saturday until yesterday, told reporters the purpose of his visit was to explain Soviet policy in Asia and the Pacific.

While in New Zealand he met Deputy Foreign Minister Frank O'Flynn, Opposition Overseas Trade spokesman Warren Cooper, and the Secretaries of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Industry, Merwyn Norrish and Harry Clark.

On the question of the protocols to the treaty, he had told Mr O'Flynn that he could consider that he had Soviet agreement for those, Dr Kapitsa said.

"Now when we have more information I can say very definitely that the Soviet Union will sign the appropriate protocols attached to the agreement declaring the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone."

Later, Dr Kapitsa said that the Soviet Union would not be prepared to sign the protocols until an "appropriate number" of countries had ratified the document and it was valid.

It needs to be ratified by four more countries to take effect.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister, the first to visit this country, also issued an assurance that the Soviet Union was not going to interfere in New Zealand's internal affairs or politics and had no ambitions here.

The purpose of a confidence building agreement between New Zealand and the Soviet Union, he said, would be to ensure that neither country "suspects the other in any evil designs" and to create an atmosphere of trust.

On fishing agreements with South Pacific countries, Dr Kapitsa said the agreement with Kiribati was for one year and had now finished.

He did not know if it would be extended.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

EDITORIAL URGES U.S. TO MAKE CONCESSIONS

Hong Kong SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST in English 30 Jul 86 p 12

[Editorial: "Stagecraft and the Arms Control Process"]

[Text] MIKHAIL Gorbachev has consistently managed to upstage Ronald Reagan, the former actor. His peace overtures have made American concessions appear grudging and half-hearted, and he has appeared to put Mr Reagan on the defensive.

First, in November last year, just before their Geneva summit, Mr Gorbachev appealed for a reduction in both sides' land-based, long-range missiles, a token gesture, he said, which would be a sign of good faith. The White House rejected it with waffle about it failing to meet "our criteria of stability, balance and equity."

Mr Gorbachev won warm reviews after his appearance in Geneva, following this up with a renewal of Russia's moratorium on nuclear weapons testing. In January, he earned loud applause for his bravura performance in offering a plan to rid the world of nuclear weapons by 2000. The Reagan response to this headline-grabbing gesture was muted, and consisted of a counter-proposal to eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons from Europe by the end of the decade, a more practicable suggestion than Mr Gorbachev's, but which lacked the Soviet leader's panache.

Within three months, Mr Gorbachev delivered three more *coups de theatre:* a call for a meeting between the five permanent members of the United Nations to explore ways to ease international tension; a pledge that the Soviet bloc would never strike first against the West, and an offer of major cuts in Warsaw Pact conventional forces in Europe.

It is hard to compete with all of this, and Mr Reagan seems to have given up trying. His latest move was an offer to delay deploying space-based missile defences until 1993, which Mr Gorbachev, in his Vladivostok speech on Monday, politely said would be considered "attentively and seriously."

The drawback in Mr Reagan's offer is that his bargaining tool is illusory; the technology for converting the Strategic Defence Initiative into reality does not exist yet. The earliest estimates for deployment are the mid-1990s in any case and so Mr Reagan's gesture was entirely without substance. In return for this meaningless offer, he was seeking cuts in the nuclear arsenals of both superpowers and an end to the Soviet Union's opposition to the concept of space becoming the battleground of the future.

Both nations are led by men who are masters of public relations techniques. Neither is willing to see his country concede an inch. Yet both wish to maintain the illusion

that their intentions at the negotiating table are serious. However, the present charades should not obscure the fact that opportunities for genuine progress are being wasted.

The United States has one such opportunity within easy reach. On August 6, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing expires. The Russians have said they would extend it if the US was to stop its own underground bomb experiments. The US has so far resisted this offer, arguing it needs to test its older weapons and that monitoring Soviet compliance which such an agreement would be impossible.

The American arguments are not convincing: the US is widely believed to be testing new weaponry linked to the SDI, rather than older warheads, and new seismographic equipment installed throughout the Soviet Union by a team of US and Russian scientists would make monitoring easy.

Substantive agreement between America and the Soviet Union is not without precedent. The talks in Stockholm aimed at preventing a conventional war breaking out in Europe are a worthwhile role model. One of the main sticking points in those talks, which centred around advance notification of military manoeuvres, was the problem of exercises by the air forces of the participating nations. The Soviets wanted advance warning of airborne exercises, while the Western allies said this was impossible, primarily because monitoring compliance would be virtually impossible. The Soviets dropped this demand, clearing the way for a detailed agreement before the three-year talks adjourn on September 19.

The Reagan administration has already set one dangerous precedent – by making it clear it no longer felt bound by the terms of the 1979 SALT-II pact. If the US feels on safe ground by deciding to ignore a treaty entered into in good faith because, basically, a new occupant of the White House and his advisers do not feel it was sound, the way is surely now open for the Soviet Union to decide it can also break any agreement that it feels uncomfortable with.

To prevent this, and to demonstrate that its commitment to disarmament is honest, the US must be prepared to make some concessions. Mr Gorbachev is stealing the limelight by his mastery of the grand gesture; Mr Reagan is in danger of missing his cue entirely. A US ban on weapons testing would be simple and practical and a change from the rhetoric of recent months.

/13046
CSO: 5250/0005

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

U.S.-SOVIET TALKS 4 SEPTEMBER--Geneva, 9 Sep (TASS)--The second round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on the problem of ending nuclear weapon testing opened here today. The talks comprise the entire range of the questions of control and determining the ways of the complete termination of nuclear tests. The Soviet delegation is headed by Chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy Andranik Petrosyants. The U.S. delegation is headed by Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Robert Baker. The first round of the talks was held in Geneva from 25 July to 1 August, 1986. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 4 Sep 86 LD] /9274

CSO: 5200/1560

RELATED ISSUES

ZHUKOV ASSAILS U.S. RESPONSE TO INITIATIVES

PM291222 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Zhukov "Political Observer's Notes": "Three Monkey Diplomacy"]

[Text] Broadway souvenir stalls do a brisk trade in popular satirical models depicting three monkeys sitting beside each other. One is covering his ears, the other his eyes, and the third his mouth. This means "I do not want to hear anything," "I do not want to see anything," "I do not want to agree with you."

These models would probably go very well in the offices of official State Department, Pentagon, and White House spokesmen. When one reads telegrams about how they react to any initiatives and proposals from the Soviet Union and other countries aimed at reaching agreement on ending the arms race and normalizing interstate relations, one cannot help but remember those monkeys.

The USSR has announced its decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 and is proposing to prepare an agreement ending nuclear weapons tests and to sign a Soviet-U.S. agreement on this by the end of the year. As if in reply the United States reported its preparations for the holding of the 19th nuclear explosion at the Nevada test range since 6 August last year.

Is the USSR continuing to insist on the elimination of nuclear weapons? The United States responds to this with the news that 10 new MX first-strike intercontinental nuclear missiles will be "made ready" by December at Warren Air Base.

Is the USSR proposing to reduce the activity of naval forces? The United States announces its decision to acquire 27 of the latest Aegis cruisers at a cost of a billion dollars each, and naval officers are stating that with such ships U.S. naval forces will be able to "operate more aggressively during an attack (!)" -- I am quoting THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR of 21 August.

Is the USSR proposing the preparation and conclusion an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the elimination of chemical weapons stockpiles and plants producing such weapons by the end of the year? K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency immediately writes an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES in which he states that: "In order to have a chance of introducing a ban we must ensure that our representatives do not go to the talks empty-handed. That is why Congress must approve the administration's request for appropriations for the production (!) of binary chemical weapons."

Is the USSR advocating a political settlement of regional conflicts? In response the White House steps up pressure on Congress to allocate more money more rapidly for waging undeclared wars against states whose social systems are not to Washington's liking.

Is the USSR striving to normalize bilateral relations with the United States, to develop cultural ties, and to expand exchanges of people between the two countries? AP reports that the response to this at the end of last week was anti-Soviet demonstrations in dozens of North American and three West European cities.

That is how it is -- everywhere and in everything. One wonders what those who build their international relations in such a cowboy manner are aiming at? The diplomacy of three peevish monkeys who want to see and hear nothing and do not want to agree to anything will bring the United States no kudos.

And it was no accident that on 24 August NEWSDAY referred in alarm to the fact that although official Washington spokesman had hastened to high-handedly reject the USSR's appeal to the United States to follow its example and end nuclear tests, the 18 August statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee had met with a sympathetic response worldwide -- including U.S. allies, Britain excepted.

Ultimately someone will be obliged to take his fingers out of his ears, open his eyes, listen to what is happening in the world, and realize that in our era arbitrarianess in international relations only damages those who resort to it. So is it not time for those who hitherto have been stubbornly reluctant to take account of reality, to have a rethink and change to more civilized methods of international discourse, leaving the habits of the jungle to one side?

/9274
CSO: 5200/1561

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA LAUDS SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL'S STANCE ON ARMS

PM281340 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Aug 86 Second Edition p 6

[V. Rybakov report: "Socialist International Today: Concluding Remarks on the Lima Congress"]

[Excerpt]

Lima-Moscow -- In the Central Committee's Political Report at the 27th CPSU Congress and in the documents adopted by the congress, questions of relations with socialist, social-democratic, and labor parties were examined from the viewpoint of strengthening the potential of peace, reason, and good will, the confrontation between progress and reaction, and the activation of the struggle for peace and international security. The CPSU expressed the determination to continue the line of cooperation with social democracy to achieve those aims.

Is there a movement in response -- and if so, how big -- from social democracy itself and from social democracy itself and from its international organization, the Socialist International?

The characteristic trend in the Socialist International in the past decade has been the striving for "universalization."

First, with regard to issues. The Socialist International's range of official concerns incorporates more and more new questions -- peaceful coexistence and detente in the nuclear age, the limitation of the arms race, local conflicts and situations in particular regions of the world, the economic crisis and "North-South" relations, and environmental protection.

Second, with regard to membership and organizational structures: Whereas the socialist International began in 1951 as a primarily West European organization, now around one-third of its members are parties from the developing countries.

In brief, increasing efforts are being made to present the Socialist International as a global organization offering a contemporary solution to global problems. The 17th Socialist International Congress, held in Lima recently and attended by this writer, was intended precisely to evaluate the results of those efforts and to determine future plans.

This was the first congress to be held in a developing country in Latin America -- Peru. The agenda was very extensive. Questions of peace and disarmament were

prominent. The very development of the international situation dictated that the closest attention should be paid to those questions. On the one hand there is the exacerbation of that situation, resulting from the U.S. Administration's provocative actions (its continuation of nuclear tests despite the unilateral Soviet moratorium, the statement of intent to cease observing the SALT II Treaty, its stubborn attempt to transfer the arms race to space, and the decision to produce binary chemical armaments). On the other hand, there are the all-embracing peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union, to which the participants' attention was again drawn by the CPSU Central Committee's message to the congress.

The congress' materials contain the Socialist International's customary calls over the past decade to the United States and the USSR to end the arms race and also -- a sign of the times -- to begin a "new phase of detente." But the formulations of specific stances, I think, reflect more fully the realities of the mid-eighties.

The congress urged the rapid ending and subsequent complete banning of all nuclear weapons tests and the conclusion of a corresponding all-embracing treaty. The congress' main resolution -- the Lima manifesto -- writes: "The Socialist International urgently appeals to the U.S. Government to change its negative stance on the question of the complete and general banning of nuclear weapons tests."

The congress participants opposed the militarization of space and supported its use exclusively for peaceful purposes. The manifesto noted the need to "prevent the development of ground-, air-, or space-based ABM and antisetellite systems." In this connection, mention was made of the importance of observing and strengthening the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty.

The delegates also supported the principle of a 50-percent reduction in the existing nuclear arsenals, a halt to the buildup of medium-range nuclear facilities and their subsequent reduction and elimination, the strengthening of procedures relating to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the rejection of the deployment of nuclear weapons in new countries and their removal from countries where they are already deployed, and the creation of nuclear-free zones and corridors. The main resolution emphasized the need to "strictly observe the ceilings set by the SALT I and SALT II treaties." Virtually all the parties represented at the congress approved the idea of the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons.

The congress urged the ending of the development, creation, and deployment of chemical weapons and their subsequent complete elimination, and supported the joint proposal of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and SED on the creation of a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe.

The proposal on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe put forward by the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest received a positive response in Lima. This initiative also found support among those circles of the West European social democratic movement opposed to the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, including medium-range weapons, there so long as the present level of military confrontation in the conventional arms sphere persists.

The sessions frequently voiced keen criticism of Washington's provocative actions, which inflame international tension and undermine progress at the arms limitation and reduction talks. Nevertheless, in the congress documents, the authors sought to observe the traditional line of the Socialist International's "equidistance" from the positions of the "two superpowers."

The discussion of the questions of peace and disarmament at this congress showed that within the ranks of the international social democratic movement there is quite a profound awareness of the reality of the threat to mankind's existence created by the arms race and of the impossibility of ensuring one's own security at the expense of someone else's.

Clearly, the potential contained in the CPSU's line of developing contacts and cooperation with the social democratic movement, primarily in the prevention of nuclear war and in the struggle for international security, is considerable. The usefulness -- for both communists and social democrats -- of an unprejudiced examination at each other's positions and views is indisputable.

The CPSU Central Committee's messages to two successive Socialist International Congresses -- the 16th and 17th -- play a role in that examination. The receipt of the message from the USSR was announced in Lima on the first day of work. In Brazil and Venezuela an account of it was published in the press. As Willy Brandt, the Socialist International chairman, noted at the final press conference, the documents approved in Lima show that the content of the Soviet message was reflected in the congress' work.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1561

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET TALK SHOW ON ECONOMIC BURDEN OF ARMS RACE

LD011658 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 31 Aug 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner, with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] Today I'd like to run a question of principle by both of you. I'd like to first of all remind you of a statement that was made not long ago by President Ronald Reagan.

He said that he was -- and I quote -- optimistic that we are going to make more progress than probably has been made in a number of years becasue of some of the problems that are concerning the general secretary at this time. He was alluding to General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and to the economic problems of the Soviet Union. There's a general view that economic problems are going to impel the Soviet Union to make important compromised in the area of arms control and arms reduction and that the entire SDI idea -- perhaps not as seen by President Reagan but certainly by his closest advisers -- pursues the goal of putting the Soviet Union into an arms race that is economically going to make it very difficult for the Soviet Union to survive. That is basically what I'd like to talk about today, and let's begin with whatever each one of you would like to say in a general reply to this.

[Bogdanov] [Passage omitted] To my mind it's rather political than economical problem, you know. What they call economical its's in verity political. Now I have, you know, very rich imagination and my imagination leads me to forties and fifties and I just see...

[Pozner, interrupting] You mean the 1940s and 1950s.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, we are in 1950s and I just, with the help of my imagination, I see some political figures of those glorious days of beginning of the Cold War and I see before my eyes some famous American documents, you know, which are now declassified, for instance, a famous NC...

[Pozner, interrupting] NSC.

[Bogdanov] NSC-68 and some other documents, and what strikes me with them is that what American president says now in '86 it's one to one with what was already said 30 years ago. So my first point is that we have come already across all that. There is nothing new for us. We always from time to time come acrss some, you know, crazy let me -- I'm sorry for that -- but some crazy ideas of American high-ups to exhaust Soviet Union

from within, to make us soft by making our economy collapse. I leave to the consciense on the noble people, on gentlemen -- I'm not sure, is it a gentlemanlike behaviour or not? I leave to them you know. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] Dr Bogdanov, you are saying basically, that this idea of bankrupting the Soviet Union as pronounced in the 1980's by the Reagan administration is not a new idea but it dates back 40 years.

[Bogdanov] Yeah.

[Pozner] Okay. Now, Professor Plekhanov, would you care to join in this discussion? Have you got anything to say about this concept?

[Plekhanov] Yeah. I think it's an interesting reflection on the (?mind-set) of U.S. policymakers. They pose the problem in this way: If there had been no economic constraints in the Soviet Union on an unbridled arms race, then the Soviet Union would have an unbridled arms race. In other words, it is considered a natural impulse of a state to build up as many arms as possible and it's only the economic constraints that prevent it from doing so. I think that reflects exactly how things are in an American economy because there is a very strong economic impulse in the United States in favor of a continued arms race. There are very strong and powerful vested interests in the U.S. economy pushing the U.S. government toward investing more and more in ever new types of weapons and trying to outstrip the Soviet Union and so on.

In the Soviet Union there are no such interests, there are no such mechanisms which would impel the Soviet economy inexorably in favor of the arms race. In fact there are the opposite mechanisms. The same which Mr. Reagan called a constraint, namely the necessity to spend a lot of money and resources on social needs, this is what makes the Soviet economy tick. This is the main thing in the Soviet economy. Investment in people and people's needs, investment in social developments, investments in greater technological and economic progress: All those things are a natural, a natural thing in the Soviet Union.

[Pozner] Yes, but wait a minute. What you bring up may be true, but Americans are saying, American leaders have been analyzing the statement of Soviet leadership and they're saying: Look, Mikhail Gorbachev went to Siberia, went to the Far East, and he quite clearly said that they want to develop this whole area and for that they need money, they need a working economy. Now isn't it true that if we force them into an arms race, they won't be able to do what they're trying to do; that is, they do have internal problems that would make them more seemingly pliant or pliable to American conditions?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think that's another side of the question. Let me respond to what you just said. I think, in the first place, they pose again that the defense needs of the Soviet Union are the same as defense needs of the United States. We have no globalist desires like the United States has. We have no systems of overseas bases. Look, most of the money that the United States spends on so-called defense actually is spent on the projection of force, military force of the United States abroad. The defense of the United States' territory from foreign attack actually takes up only about 10 percent of the U.S. military budget. All the rest is maintenance of forces abroad, maintenance of all those huge fleets which prowl the oceans, the Marine Corps and the rest of it, you know, aid, foreign military aid to the allies, and so on and so forth. Now, the structure of their defense spending is quite different from ours. Ours is geared to the safeguarding the defense of the Soviet Union and its allies. And therefore I think they simply misunderstand the nature of the problem when they think

that the Soviet Union is going to try to match them dollar for dollar, ruble, ruble for dollar...

[Bogdanov interrupting] Yeah. And there is another point which is very important to my mind...

[Pozner interrupting] Radomir Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] In our defense build-up we always find out cheaper solutions than Americans do. And let me talk a little bit about SDI. SDI for the [words indistinct] economical exhaustion of the Soviet Union takes a very special place. They believe that in case they deploy we will be exhausted because we cannot match them. But they do forget one thing: that our technology is very different than the American. And we'll find out a much cheaper answer to American SDI than they think we will be going [to], and we have stated that--and I'm sure that our American listeners over there, they don't know that--that general secretary stated officially that we will not be going by the way the American would like us to go in SDI business, that will be very different. Of course, we don't know which way he meant. It's a secret and I understand it's really secret. But to my mind it's really childish on the American side to operate in all that on the base of the mirror image, to look at their own military expenses, how they are huge, how they are devastating, you know, and look at our expenses in the same way. And they forget one psychological thing. I have in fact touched upon it at begnning of my answering your question, you know. Being twice invaded within 6C years of existence, you have a special feeling about your national security.

It's something of a kind of a sacred cow, you know, and if you have a feeling of a danger, you put aside your bread and butter and you get down to real business of securing your national security, which is not known to Americans. And I don't wish they know that, you know. So I believe those are important points to be understood by our American listeners.

[Pozner] Dr Bogdanov, you said that we don't exactly know what the Sovet response to SDI might be, and of course we don't, but I recall last Wednesday's news conference in which one of the leading Soviet nuclear physicists participated, and when he was asked what did the general secretary have in mind in his statement when he said that should the Untied States go ahead with SDI the Soviets would find a very effective answer to it, he made it clear that it is much easier to deal with objects in stationary orbit in space than it is with warheads and that it's much cheaper to deal with them than it is to build some new very sophisticated system. So obviously we're not going go economically that way, that's clear. Yes, please, er?

[Plekhanov] I think that this kind of discourse really shows us and demonstrates that the competition in arraments is really a suicidal thing for mankind because, you know, what we're talking about is which of the two economies is going to be damaged more by the military build-up.

[Pozner] Well, that's a good question.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, but, I think so, but I think it's, it's something. It's something. It's almost like comparig like how many times we'll be able to destroy each other in case of a nuclear war, because it's clear tht the excessive military spending is doing damage to both the American and the Soviet economy, and of course it would be much better for both countries and both nations to live without the arms race, to live with much much less spending on military needs.

[Pozner] I agree with you. there's a Russian...

[Plekhanov interrupting] Ok, there is a common interest.

[Pozner] OK, there's a Russian saying that it's better to be rich and healthy than to be poor and sick.

[Plekhanov] Right, but in this case it's also a choice between surviving or not surviving, because it's not just spending ourselves into poverty through the arms race, it's also having the total annihilation at the end of it.

[Pozner] Nobody would argue with you that it's better to be alive than dead.

[Plekhanov] Sure, sure.

[Bogdanov] No, no, no, wait a minute. I know some people tell you they'll do [words indistinct].

[Pozner] Than red.

[Bogdanov] Than red.

[Plekhanov] But we're not saying you have to be red to be alive, we're saying you can be alive red any you can be alive white.

[Pozner] But with time runing out I would like to have your final view on one question. Are economic considerations able to force the Soviet Union into the kind of compromises it would not like to do, and are economic considerations so strong that the Soviet Union will simply not be able to stand up to what the United States will be doing in the development of arms? A short answer from both of you on that.

[Bogdanov] My view is absolutely no and no.

[Pozner] Ok, what about you?

[Plekhanov] I quite agree, no to both questions, no question about it.

[Pozner] So you would say it is not realistic and dangerous to plan on getting the Soviet Union to its knees economically?

[Bogdanov] Dreamers, dreamers.

[Plekhanov] It's like shooting us and shooting themselves in the foot, if those people are planning it.

[Bogdanov] Then they are just dreamers.

[Pozner] Well thank you very much. I want to thank our listeners for tuning in. Let us know what you feel, what other questions you would like us to answer. Till a week from today this is Vladimir Pozner saying good listening on the part of Top Priority.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1561

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA REITERATES JOINT ASIAN SECURITY TENETS

PM011901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[W. Ovchinnikov article: "In Five Directions"]

[Text] The Asian and pacific region covers almost one-half of the globe. This is why the call, issued in Vladivostok, to improve the situation in its vast expanses and jointly to build new and fair relations in Asia and the Pacific stirred the hearts of hundreds of millions of people on our planet.

The Asian-Pacific direction of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is part of the overall platform of the CPSU's international activity, elaborated by the April plenum and the 27th party congress. The development of events in this part of the world is of national and state interest to our country. This, however, is in no way a claim for some kind of privileges, or a quest for advantages to the detriment of others, or an attempt to consolidate our own security at someone else's expense. The Soviet Union perceives its interests in the pooling of efforts, in cooperation with complete respect for all people's right to live according to their own choice and to solve their problems independently under conditions of peace. This view of international security, of university security, was reaffirmed in the 18 August statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on Soviet Television concerning the USSR's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions until the end of the year.

Immediate measures are needed in order to include the Asian and Pacific region in the process of creating an all-embracing system of international security. Speaking in Vladivostok, M.S. Gorbachev proposed for this purpose a comprehensive program of action in five directions. First -- or rather paramount among them -- are questions of regional settlement. They concern the situation around Afghanistan and Cambodia and the tension in the Korean Peninsula.

The USSR supports the present Afghan leadership's line of national reconciliation and expansion of the social base of the April Revolution. Some progress was achieved recently at the Afghan-Pakistani talks conducted through a representatives of the UN secretary general. In its desire to speed up the political settlement and give it another fillip, the Soviet leadership undertook a serious step. Six Soviet regiments will return home from Afghanistan by the end of this year. As soon as a political settlement is finally elaborated in Geneva, the return of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan could be correspondingly speeded up. It is to be hoped that the Soviet initiative will be correctly understood and evaluated, and that the response to it will take the form of the curtailment of outside interference in Afghan affairs. Those who encourage and finance the undeclared war must know: If the intervention agianst the DRA continues, the USSR will not abandon its neighbor in his adversity.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, there are no unsurmountable obstacles to the establishment of mutually acceptable relations between the Indochinese countries (Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia) and ASEAN, which includes Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei. The Cambodian people have made terrible sacrifices. Through its suffering, this country has truly gained the right to chose its own friends and allies. It is impermissible to drag it back into the tragic past or to decide the future fate of this state in distant capitals and even at the United Nations. As regards the Vietnamese volunteers in Cambodia, their stage-by-stage return home is planned to be fully completed in 1990. Much in this respect -- just like in other Southeast Asian problems -- depends on he normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations.

There is a possibility not only to ease the dangerous tension in the Korean peninsula but also to embark on the solution of the national problem of the whole Korean people. The way to this goal is provided by DPRK's proposals to sign a peace treaty to replace the existing armistice agreement, to adopt a declaration on nonaggression between North and South, and to mutually reduce armed forces.

The second direction of efforts, which was talked about in Vladivostok, pursues tha goal of blocking the path of the proliferation and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Asia and the Pacific. On the whole, this region is still not militarized as much as Europe. But the United States has embarked on an intensive buildup of its military presence there. The Pentagon desires to turn the countries of Asia and the Pacific, where the eastern borders of socialism lie, into a line for the deployment of forward-based nuclear means, just as it has done with Europe and the Atlantic off its shores. The United States has deployed nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and warheads in the South of the Korean peninsula. Despite the "three nonnuclear principles" on which Japan's international policy is officialy built, U.S. F-16 aircraft, intended for the delivery of nuclear strikes, are stationed on its territory, while ships from the U.S. 7th Fleet equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles periodically call in its ports. Formations of U.S. warships, including two aircraft carriers and the battleship New Jersey, which gained ill fame off the coast of Lebanon, are even now approaching the Soviet Union's sea borders to conduct provocative maneuvers in the Bering Sea.

The growing nuclear threat in the Asian and Pacific region is causing increasing anxiety among its peoples, including the Soviet people. It is well known that the USSR pledged not to increase the quantity of medium-range nuclear missiles in the country's Asian region. it supports the proclamation of a nuclear-free zone in the Southern Pacific and calls on all nuclear powers to guarantee its status unilaterally or multilaterally. An improvement of the situation in the region would be greatly helped by the implementation of the DPRK initiative to create a nuclear-free zone in the Korean peninsula. The idea of creating such a zone in Southeast Asia has gained deserved attention.

As the third element of the program announced in Vladivostok, the Soviet Union proposes reduction of the activeness of naval fleets in the Pacific, and primarily of ships equipped with nuclear weapons. It is proposed in particular to agree on renunciation of antisubmarine activity in certain zones of the Pacific. For a long time now the USSR has been calling for a restriction of naval activeness in those parts of the world ocean where the likelihood of conflict situations developing is the greatest, and for the extension of confidence-building measures to waters which are crossed by the busiest shipping lanes. The USSR reaffirmed its readiness to resume talks on the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. It has repeatedly declared that it does not intend to create military bases in its waters, and has called on the United States to adopt the same stance. The Soviet Union is a convinced champion of

the disbandment of military groups and the renunciation of foreign bases in Asia and in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. If the United States were to renounce its military presence in, say, the Philippines, the USSR would not be found wanting.

There has been a great international response to the Soviet Union's initiatives in the fourth of the directions listed in Vladivostok. We are talking about a radical reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Asia. Of course, such a problem has to be solved in parts, stage by stage, starting with one single region, like the Far East for example. Numerous commentaries appeared in the world press as a result of the news that Moscow and Ulaanbaatar are examining the question of withdrawing a considerable part of Soviet troops from Mongolia, and also that the USSR is prepared to discuss with the PRC steps toward a reciprocal and commensurate [sorazmernyy] reduction of the level of ground forces.

Finally, the fifth direction of efforts to improve the situation in Asia and the Pacific is the practical discussion of confidence-building measures and nonuse of force in the region. Some 5 years ago the USSR proposed that talks begin on confidence-building measures in the Far East.
It was clarified that the collective participation by all countries in the region was by no means mandatory for this purpose, because the way to this goal could also be paved on a bilateral basis. Now the Soviet Union proposes to begin with the simplest, and at the same time topical for everyone, measures -- like ensuring the safety of maritime communications and the prevention of international terrorism.

The USSR addresses to all countries in the Asian and Pacific region -- and not just to them -- a call to cooperate for the sake of peace and security. This is logical. In today's interconnected world, security is not divisible either between states or between regions of the world.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1561

RELATED ISSUES

IZVESTIYA: NICARAGUA CHARGES U.S. WITH 'METEOROLOGICAL WAR'

PM031453 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Special correspondent Yevg. Bay report: "Whims of the Weather, or Meteorological Weapons?"]

[Text] Managua — The front page of a recent issue of the Nicaraguan newspaper NUEVO DIARIO shows a map of Central America. Three states in the region -- Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras — are marked with a circle, as if they were in some invisible optical sights. The center of the circle is shaded in black — that is the region of a severe, prolonged drought, which has struck neighboring regions of the countries marked, adjacent to the Gulf of Fonseca.

Reports coming in from these states testify to the unusual nature of the drought. For some months now there has been virtually no precipitation in regions which differ from one another in their topographical and climatic conditions. It is characteristic that the action of the atmospheric phenomenon lessens gradually as the distance increases from the epicenter, which is in the region of El Tigre Island in the Gulf of Fonseca. It is here, the newspaper stresses, that the Pentagon has sited an air base capable of taking the most modern aircraft.

In the opinion of experts, NUEVO DIARIO writes, such a drought could only be caused artificially.

The newspaper recalls that the United States used meteorological weapons for the first time in Vietnam, causing first torrential rains, then prolonged drought there.

Why have these regions of Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua come within the Pentagon's sights? The use of meteorological weapons on each of the countries has its purpose. In the border provinces of Honduras, a shortage of foodstuffs, caused by the drought, means that the peasants are forced to leave their homes, and it is here the United States has sited its bases for training the "contras." According to the Honduran newspaper TRIBUNA, the inhabitants of more than 60 settlements were forced to go to the north of the country in search of food.

In El Salvador, the drought covers the region where the influence of rebels from the F. Marti National Liberation Front is most marked. By causing a drought in this region (according to preliminary estimates, the harvest of corn, rice, and beans could be nearly 50 percent down this season), the Washington strategists hope to deprive the patriots of their food base.

The border province of Chinandega in Nicaragua is the zone from which the "contra" gangs were driven out by the Sandinist People's Army. And the Pentagon has decided to hit that province with meteorological warfare.

Many experts in Honduras and El Salvador agree with the Nicaraguan newspapers' assessment, and believe that the unusual drought is the result of the Pentagon's use of meteorological weapons.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1561

END